DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 427 369 CS 510 003

AUTHOR	Whitney, Shawnlee A., Ed.
TITLE	National Developmental Conference on Individual Events Addressing Individual Events, NFA Lincoln-Douglas Debate, and NPDA Parliamentary Debate Conference Proceedings (3rd, Houston, Texas, August 13-16, 1997).
PUB DATE	1997-00-00
NOTE	224p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Debate; *Debate Format; Higher Education; Oral Interpretation; Persuasive Discourse
IDENTIFIERS	*Debate Coaches; *Debate Tournaments; Individual Events (Forensics); National Parliamentary Debate Association

ABSTRACT

This proceedings presents 19 papers delivered a National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, addressing individual events, Lincoln-Douglas debate, and parliamentary debate. After presenting the conference schedule, the list of attendees, and resolutions, papers in the proceedings are: "The Ghostwriter, The Laissez-Faire Coach, and the Forensic Professional: Negotiating the Overcoaching vs. Undercoaching Dilemma in Original Contest Speeches" (James J. Kimble); "Professionalism and Forensics: A Matter of Choice" (Larry Schnoor and Bryant K. Alexander); "Creating Space for the Physically Challenged Competitor in Individual Events" (David L. Kosloski); "Creating an Individual Events Judging Philosophy" (Jeff Przybylo); "Challenging the Conventions of Oral Interpretation" (Chris S. Aspdal); "Returning to Our Roots: A New Direction for Oral Interpretation" (Trischa Knapp); "Developing Functional Standards as a means to Greater Accessibility in NFA-LD" (John M. Devine); "Maintaining the Status Quo: Recommendations for Preserving Public Argument in Parliamentary Debate" (Steven L. Johnson); "Forensics Fellows: Integrating Faculty Participation into Intercollegiate Parliamentary Debate Programs" (Lewis E. Rutledge); "Presumption in Parliamentary Debate: Examining Whately's Ideas and Their Application to an Emerging and Evolving Debate Style" (Tammy Duvanel Unruh); "Forensics Education and Tournament Management" (Joel Hefling); "Equal Opportunity?: The Impact of Specialized Tournaments on Forensics Pedagogy, Forensics Professionals, and the Forensic Laboratory" (Scott Jensen); "Judge Agreement and Student Rotation: A Real-Life Study of the 1990 DSR-TKA National Forensics Tournament" (Vicki L. Karns); "AFA-NIET: The Culture of Qualifying and Its Effects on Forensics" (Daniel A. West); "Teaching and Coaching Individuals: The Use of Learning Styles in Forensics Coaching" (Thomas Bartl); "Solving for a Healthy Future: Creating National Standards for Training Future Directors of Forensics" (Thomas A. Workman); "New Directions for Public Speaking: The Perfect Pendulum Swings" (M'Liss S. Hindman); "Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory: A Model for Differentiating After Dinner Speaking from Informative and Persuasive Speaking" (C. Thomas Preston, Jr.); and "If It's Problem-Cause-Solution This Must Be Persuasive Speaking: Are We Short-changing the Art of Persuasion?" (Shawnalee A. Whitney). (RS)

ED 427 369

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

THIRD NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

ADDRESSING
INDIVIDUAL EVENTS, NFA LINCOLN-DOUGLAS DEBATE, & NPDA PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Rice University, Houston, Texas
August 13-16, 1997

Coordinated & Co-Hosted by
Daniel A. West, Rice University
M'Liss Hindman, Tyler Junior College

Conference Proceedings Compiled and Edited by
Shawnalee A. Whitney, University of Alaska Anchorage

CS510003

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Whitney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

2

3

Editor's Notes

National developmental conferences like the one in Houston have been an important touchstone for the forensics community for many years. They serve as a time to regroup, to reflect, and plan for our future. We can see the influence of ideas addressed at developmental conferences when we attend tournaments throughout the country. In addition, I have heard colleagues remark that attending a developmental conference early in their careers shaped their forensics pedagogy in very significant and long-lasting ways. It seemed appropriate then, that we embraced the theme of *Professionalism and Forensics* with the 1997 conference as we took a look at where we have been and where we are going.

While the purpose of this conference was to focus on individual events, NFA-LD debate and NPDA-style parliamentary debate, those who attended the 1997 conference represented a broad range of intercollegiate forensic organizations. Presenters and attendees were affiliated with Phi Rho Pi, PKD, DSR-TKA, the AFA-NIET, NFA, NPDA, and even CEDA/NDT. Undergraduates, graduate students, new coaches, and veteran forensic educators attended the conference. Not surprisingly, the resolutions and papers included in this packet of conference proceedings address a broad range of issues and interests reflective of the broad range of people who were present in Houston.

The table of contents includes a complete listing of the papers and presenters who were accepted for the conference. Papers not included in this packet are indicated with an asterisk. The materials included in this packet are as complete as possible. People who were listed in the conference program but did not attend or present papers were contacted prior to the publication of these proceedings to verify that they did not attend and/or to check on the status of their papers. In short, I have done everything possible to ensure that those papers not included in this packet were left out at the author's request or because they did not attend the conference.

I want to echo the sentiments of the conference attendees in thanking Dan West, M'Liss Hindman, and the Rice University Speech and Debate Team for their efforts in coordinating and hosting the 1997 developmental conference. Like many of us in the forensics community, Dan and M'Liss felt that far too many years had passed since the last developmental conference on individual events in Denver in 1990. I appreciate the fact that they took the proverbial bull by the horns and invited us to Houston.

I am grateful for the personal and professional support I have received from many colleagues in the forensics community while I have worked on this document. Editing this compilation was not an easy task and your kind words at tournaments and thoughtful notes through email have been very helpful. Finally, I am appreciative of the support I received from my colleagues in the Department of Communication at the University of Alaska Anchorage. The Department Secretary, Christine Simonka, was always good-natured about letting me use her computer and she provided helpful information throughout the process. In addition, I want to mention the efforts of my editorial assistant, Laure C. MacConnell, a member of UAA's Seawolf Speech and Debate Team. I am indebted to her for the significant time and effort she put forth in helping me with these proceedings.

Shawnalee A. Whitney
Conference Proceedings Editor
Co-Director of Forensics
University of Alaska Anchorage
March 9, 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 . . . Conference Schedule

2 . . . List of Attendees

3 . . . Resolutions

PAPERS FROM THE KEYNOTE SESSION

7 . . . James J. Kimble, George Mason University
The Ghostwriter, The Laissez-Faire Coach, and the Forensic Professional: Negotiating the Overcoaching vs. Undercoaching Dilemma in Original Contest Speeches

14 . . . Larry Schnoor, St. Olaf College &
Bryant K. Alexander, Southern Illinois University
Professionalism and Forensics: A Matter of Choice

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR EVALUATION & JUDGING

18 . . . David L. Kosloski, Hastings College
Creating Space for the Physically Challenged Competitor in Individual Events

20 . . . Jeff Przybylo, Harper College
Creating an Individual Events Judging Philosophy

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR ORAL INTERPRETATION

24 . . . Chris S. Aspdal
Challenging the Conventions or Oral Interpretation

29 . . . Trischa Knapp
Returning to our Roots: A New Direction for Oral Interpretation

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR NPDA & NFA LD

35 . . . John M. Devine, University of Rhode Island
Developing Functional Standards as a means to Greater Accessibility in NFA-LD

39 . . . Steven L. Johnson, University of Alaska Anchorage
Maintaining the Status Quo: Recommendations for Preserving Public Argument in Parliamentary Debate

43 . . . Lewis E. Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene College
Forensics Fellows: Integrating Faculty Participation into Intercollegiate Parliamentary Debate Programs

56 . . . Tammy Duvanel Unruh, Bethel College (KS)
Presumption in Parliamentary Debate: Examining Whately's Ideas and their Application to an Emerging and Evolving Debate Style

TOURNAMENT MANAGEMENT

61 . . . Joel Hefling, South Dakota State University
Forensics Education and Tournament Management

66 . . . Scott Jensen, Webster University
Equal Opportunity?: The Impact of Specialized Tournaments on Forensics Pedagogy, Forensics Professionals, and the Forensic Laboratory

73 . . . Vicki L. Karns, Suffolk University
Judge Agreement and Student Rotation: A Real-Life Study of the 1990 DSR-TKA National Forensics Tournament

79 . . . Daniel A. West, Rice University
AFA-NIET: The Culture of Qualifying and Its Effects on Forensics

TRAINING OF COACHES AND JUDGES

81 . . . Thomas Bartl, Southwest State University
Teaching and Coaching Individuals: The Use of Learning Styles in Forensics Coaching

83 . . . Thomas A. Workman, University of Nebraska Lincoln
Solving for a Healthy Future: Creating National Standards for Training Future Directors of Forensics

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING

87 . . . M'Liss S. Hindman
New Directions for Public Speaking: The Perfect Pendulum Swings

91 . . . C. Thomas Preston, Jr.
Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory: A Model for Differentiating After Dinner Speaking from Informative and Persuasive Speaking

100. . . Shawnalee A. Whitney
If It's Problem-Cause-Solution This Must Be Persuasive Speaking: Are We Short-changing the Art of Persuasion?

CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

(Note: This schedule includes all papers & presenters accepted for the conference.)

Wednesday, August 13, 1997

8:00-9:00pm	Registration for Pre-Conference Short Courses

Thursday, August 14, 1997

8:00-8:20am	Shuttles depart for Rice University campus
8:30-11:30am	**Short Course I:** ***Professionalism & Forensics*** Peter Pober, University of Texas
11:30am	Lunch & Discussion
1:00-4:00pm	**Short Course II:** ***Creating a Judging Philosophy of Individual Events*** Jeff Przybylo, Harper College
4:00pm	Shuttles return to Holiday Inn
4:00-6:00pm	Conference Registration - Holiday Inn
5:00-7:00pm	Reception/Social Hour - Holiday Inn
7:00pm	Shuttles depart for Ninfa's Restaurant (banquet)

Friday, August 15, 1997

8:00-8:20am	Shuttles depart for Rice University campus
8:30am	Continental Breakfast
9:00am	***SESSION I***
	Standards for Evaluation and Judging David Kosloski, Hastings College Jeff Przybylo, Harper College
	New Directions for Oral Interpretation Chris Aspdal, University of Houston Trischa Knapp, Oregon State University
	New Directions for NPDA & NFA LD John Devine, Suffolk University Judith Bowker, Oregon State University & Robert Trapp, Willamette University Steven Johnson, University of Alaska, Anchorage Lewis Rutledge, Pt. Loma Nazarene College Tammy Unruh, Bethel College
12:15pm	Lunch and Discussion
2:00pm	***SESSION II***
	Tournament Management Joel Hefling, South Dakota State University Vicki Karns, Suffolk University Scott Jensen, Webster University Dan West, Rice University
	Training of Coaches and Judges Thomas Bartl, Southwest State University Bob Greenstreet, East Central University Tom Workman, University of Nebraska, Lincoln
	New Directions for Public Speaking M'Liss Hindman, Tyler Junior College Tom Preston, Univ. of Missouri St. Louis Shawnalee Whitney, Univ. of Alaska Anchorage
5:15pm	Shuttles return to Holiday Inn

Saturday, August 16, 1997

8:00-8:20am	Shuttles depart for Rice University campus
8:30am	Continental Breakfast
9:00am	***KEYNOTE SESSION*** Jim Kimble, Geoge Mason University Peter Pober, University of Texas Larry Schnoor, St. Olaf College & Bryant Alexander, Southern Illinois University
11:30am	Lunch and Discussion
1:30pm	SESSION SUMMARIES/LEGISLATIVE FORUM Program Chairs present summaries of their sessions followed by open discussion and development of conference recommendations/resolutions.
5:00pm	Shuttles return to Holiday Inn

CONFERENCE ATTENDEES

Mr. Chris Aspdal
University of Houston
Houston, TX

Prof. Thomas Bartl
Southwest State University
Marshall, MN

Mr. Amir Brown
Rice University
Houston, TX

Prof. Natalie Bryant
South Plains College
Levelland, TX

Mr. Jason Cryer
University of Houston
Houston, TX

Mr. Greg Cunningham
Suffolk University
Boston, MA

Prof. John Devine
University of Rhode Island
Kingston, RI

Dr. Susan Redding Emel
Baker University
Baldwin City, KS

Mr. Dave Gallant
Suffolk Univeristy
Boston, MA

Prof. Konrad W. Hack
Pt. Loma Nazarene College
San Diego, CA

Prof. Joel Hefling
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD

Prof. M'Liss Hindman
Tyler Junior College
Tyler, TX

Prof. Lisa Hischke
San Jacinto Central College
Houston, TX

Ms. Gina Jensen
Webster University
St. Louis, MO

Prof. Scott Jensen
Webster University
St. Louis, MO

Prof. Steven L. Johnson
Univ. of Alaska, Anchorage
Anchorage, AK

Prof. Mike Jones
Lee College
Baytown, TX

Dr. Vicki Karns
Suffolk University
Boston, MA

Prof. Jim Kimble
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

Dr. Trischa Knapp
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR

Prof. David Kosloski
Hastings College
Hastings, NE

Mr. Mike Larson
South Dakota State University
Brookings, SD

Ms. Jodi Maffioli
Suffolk University
Boston, MA

Ms. Courtney Massingill
San Jacinto Central College
Houston, TX

Ms. Lauren McGarity
Rice University
Houston, TX

Mr. John Nash
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS

Dr. Greg Phelps
University of St. Thomas
Houston, TX

Dr. Peter Pober
University of Texas
Austin, TX

Dr. C. Thomas Preston
Univ. of Missouri - St. Louis
St. Louis, MO

Prof. Jeff Przybylo
William Rainey Harper College
Palatine, IL

Dr. David J. Robinson
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, OH

Prof. Lewis E. "Skip" Rutledge
Pt. Loma Nazarene College
San Diego, CA

Prof. Larry Schnoor
St. Olaf College
Northfield, MN

Prof. Ann Scroggie
Sante Fe Community College
Gainesville, FL

Dr. Robert Trapp
Willamette University
Salem, OR

Prof. Tammy Unruh
Bethel College
North Newton, KS

Prof. Daniel West
Rice University
Houston, TX

Prof. Shawnalee Whitney
Univ. of Alaska, Anchorage
Anchorage, AK

Prof. Thomas Workman
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NE

Prof. Guy Yates
West Texas A&M University
Canyon, TX

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE THIRD NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL CONFERENCE ON INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

(addressing Individual Events, NFA-LD, & NPDA Parliamentary Debate)

August 13-16, 1997, Rice University, Houston, TX

EDITOR'S NOTES: Each new resolution is indicated with a ●. Titles of panels or sessions that developed resolutions are indicated. Most resolutions were developed in panels and were brought to the legislative session for approval or rejection by the entire group. Resolutions that were developed by the entire group in the Keynote and Legislative Sessions are grouped together. All resolutions appearing in this document were endorsed by a vote of those attending the conference. Resolutions from the Keynote and Legislative Sessions are listed first. Other resolutions are listed in the order in which the corresponding panels appeared in the conference schedule. These resolutions were sent to officers of the various national organizations and the Council of Forensics Organizations in September 1997 so the organizations could include them in discussion at the various fall meetings held during the annual National Communication Association convention.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE KEYNOTE and LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS

● The conference participants formally thank M'Liss Hindman (Tyler Junior College), Dan West (Rice University), members of the Rice University Forensics Squad (Lauren McGarity, Amir Brown, and Jason Welch), and the Rice University staff for their work in organizing and hosting the *Third National Developmental Conference on Individual Events*. The participants also thank Shawnalee Whitney (University of Alaska Anchorage) for her work in editing the conference proceedings. Their efforts have provided a forum for forensic educators to explore and develop research and resources to promote professionalism in our discipline.

● While competition and education are compatible, we believe that competitive ends that are exclusive of pedagogical ends are not conducive to forensics professionalism.

● We believe that judges should refrain from paradigms that incorporate sexist, biased, or prejudicial attitudes and should exercise tact in comments related to apparel, appearance, and so on.

● We encourage forensics organizations to consider the adoption of a new event called Oral Performance of Original Literature and suggest that all other interpretation events employ published material only.

● We support the development of a Steering Committee for the purpose of developing a 1998 National Developmental Conference on Individual Events, NFA-LD, and Parliamentary Debate. That conference would offer training for coaches/judges similar to the short courses at the 1997 conference. The following individuals have been elected to serve on the committee: M'Liss Hindman (Tyler Junior College, Tyler, TX), Scott Jensen (Webster University, St. Louis, MO), Vicki Karns (Suffolk University, Boston, MA), Jeff Przybylo (William Rainey Harper College, Palatine, IL), Dan West (Rice University, Houston, TX), Tom Workman (University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE), and Shawnalee Whitney (University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, AK).

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE PANEL ENTITLED "STANDARDS FOR EVALUATION AND JUDGING"

● We encourage the Council of Forensic Organizations to develop and distribute a one-page statement concerning the judging of student competitors who are physically challenged. This statement would include:

> 1) recommendations on judging students with temporary or permanent sensory, physical, or speech impairments (i.e. reconceiving judging paradigms based on use of manuscript, gestures or transitional movements).

2) provisions regarding the use of conventions, time limits, visual materials and/or human/animal assistance.

3) instructions for the use of this statement for all tournaments.

This statement should be distributed to all directors of forensics and those listed as tournament directors in the national calendars of all Council of Forensic Organizations affiliates, and could be invoked by a tournament director when physically challenged competitors have been entered into the tournament. A cover letter accompanying the statement would give a background of the need for judge education and the issues surrounding competition for the physically challenged student.

Justification: There is sufficient evidence that judges inappropriately compensate judging criteria or judge unfairly those students with physical challenges. Lack of education produces judges who are uncomfortable or ineffective with the physically challenged student. As a result, poor judging remains a significant reason why retention rates of physically challenged competitors are low. Such a statement from a national organization would provide a value for physically challenged competitors that currently does not exist. It removes the burden of judge education being placed solely on the coach of a physically challenged student or the student him or herself.

- We believe it is the responsibility of every Director of Forensics with graduate student staff or volunteer judges to establish a process of developing individual judge philosophies as part of judge preparation. We further believe it is the responsibility of every tournament director to provide some form of judge training at all tournaments.

- We call upon the Council of Forensic Organizations to endorse and develop a commission to determine national standards for the evaluation and training of Directors of Forensics. Once determined, national standards should be implemented through national conferences and convention short courses under existing or new certification procedures. Further, we call for the forensics community to adopt an oath or "statement of moral duty" for forensics educators reading: *"I pledge to make as my mission the education of the student through speech competition, and I commit to making choices that place the academic development of the student as my primary concern. I pledge to strive toward excellence in the knowledge and practice of my field and will work toward the betterment of my field artistically, pedagogically, ethically, and practically."*

- This body encourages forensics and communication research in the following areas:

  1) Forensics education pedagogy

  2) Empirical support for the method of forensics as communication and/or citizenship pedagogy

  3) Empirical support for competency standards of forensics coaching and administration

  4) Public speaking event issues and concerns

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE PANEL ENTITLED "NEW DIRECTIONS FOR ORAL INTERPRETATION"

- We encourage the national organizations to consider the following descriptions as guidelines for their interpretation event rules to emphasize the importance of understanding of text. (Additions to current guidelines are in CAPITAL letters.) These rule changes place the emphasis on the text by offering a purpose for engaging in interpretation of each of the genres. In addition, these proposals offer a means to achieving the understanding of the literature and finally, the proposed rule changes make theme subsidiary to understanding of the text.

Prose Interpretation: A selection or selections of prose material of literary merit DESIGNED TO ILLUMINATE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT THROUGH THE USE OF VOCAL AND PHYSICAL DELIVERY. MULTIPLE SELECTIONS MAY BE USED WHEN THE ILLUMINATED TEXTS SHARE A COMMON THEME. Play cuttings and poetry are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.

Dramatic Duo: A cutting from a play, humorous or serious, involving the portrayal of two or more characters presented by two individuals FOR THE PURPOSE OF ILLUMINATING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT THROUGH THE USE OF VOCAL AND PHYSICAL DELIVERY. This material may be drawn from stage, screen, or radio. This is not an acting event; thus, no costumes, props, lighting, etc., are to be used. Presentation is from the manuscript and the focus should be off-stage and not to each other. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.

Program Oral Interpretation: A PROGRAM OF LITERATURE FROM TWO OR THREE RECOGNIZED GENRES OF COMPETITIVE INTERPRETATION (PROSE/POETRY/DRAMA) FOR THE PURPOSE OF ILLUMINATING AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT THROUGH THE USE OF VOCAL AND PHYSICAL DELIVERY. LITERATURE SHOULD BE CHOSEN BECAUSE THE ILLUMINATED TEXTS SHARE A COMMON THEME. A substantial portion of the total time must be devoted to each of the genres used in the program. Different genre means the material must appear in separate pieces of literature (e.g. a poem included in a short story that appears only in that short story does not constitute a poetry genre). Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction and/or transitions.

Dramatic Interpretation: A cutting which represents one or more characters from a play or plays of literary merit DESIGNED TO ILLUMINATE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT THROUGH THE USE OF VOCAL AND PHYSICAL DELIVERY. MULTIPLE SELECTIONS MAY BE USED WHEN THE ILLUMINATED TEXTS SHARE A COMMON THEME. This material may be drawn from stage, screen or radio. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction.

Poetry Interpretation: A selection or selections of poetry of literary merit DESIGNED TO ILLUMINATE AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE TEXT THROUGH THE USE OF VOCAL AND PHYSICAL DELIVERY. MULTIPLE SELECTIONS MAY BE USED WHEN THE ILLUMINATED TEXTS SHARE A COMMON THEME. Play cuttings and prose works are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introductions.

- We recommend that judges recognize the value of "recycled" material for the individual performer at the time, and should communicate issues of newness and rank decisions being mindful of the student's individual expression of the material.

- We encourage coaches to guide students who desire to interpret older, "recycled" literature, to avoid copying or mimicking performance ideas and to seek out "fresh" or "novel" approaches.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE PANEL ENTITLED "NEW DIRECTIONS FOR PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE AND NFA-LD"

- We encourage debate programs and organizations to develop opportunities to provide students venues in which to develop public argument skills.

- We encourage forensic programs to utilize non-forensic faculty from various disciplines as resources for all forensic events.

- We discourage an unexamined adoption of rules, previous theoretical constructs, or previous practical conventions in debate.

- We encourage forensic organizations to develop, implement, and enforce policies to reduce sexual harassment of students, coaches, and judges and that ongoing education about sexual harassment be a priority.

- We encourage debate organizations to experiment with alternate formats including but not limited to various international formats.

- We suggest that for parliamentary debate, regardless of an adjudicator's ruling on an issue of debate procedure voiced in a Point of Order, the debate should continue in its entirety.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- We recognize debate as a unique, worthwhile activity, worthy of a student's dedication and effort.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE PANEL ENTITLED "TOURNAMENT MANAGEMENT"

- We encourage the forensics community to adopt the philosophy that competition during the course of the year should not be dictated by an emphasis on qualification procedures for national tournaments. In other words, we discourage the creation of a culture in which students and/or coaches are encouraged, explicitly or implicitly, to pull qualified slots, determining the number of students to be included in a final round based on a perception of the need for and/or lack thereof of places in those events, and the hosting of so-called "last chance" qualifying tournaments.

- We believe that experimentation in extemporaneous and impromptu speaking is worthwhile, and believe that innovations should be communicated in the tournament invitation.

- We call for tournament directors in all regions to cooperate to ensure that a variety of comprehensive and specialized tournaments are available.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE PANEL "NEW DIRECTIONS FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING"

- We encourage forensics educators to take a professional, proactive stance when responding to comments on ballots which are contradictory or condescending. Additionally, we encourage judges to make themselves available to competitors and/or coaches who seek clarification on ballot comments.

- We believe the forensics community should encourage diversity in organizational patterns, modes of persuasion, topic selection, and so on.

- We encourage tournament directors to consider the use of experimental or alternative formats to ensure the public accessibility of various events.

- We believe that tournament directors and national organizations should (re)consider the use of a brief single question (not to exceed one minute) in the final round of individual events.

- We call for a "reason for decision" section on ballots as a means of encouraging judges to more clearly justify and explain ranks and speaker points. In cases where such a section is not included on ballots, judges should be encouraged to provide clear justification or their own "reason for decision" section.

- We encourage national organizations and tournament directors to provide advisory point guidelines similar to those used by the National Parliamentary Debate Association to delineate the differences between speaker points (e.g. what does a 15 mean, a 16, a 17, and so on).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract: There has long been concern in forensic circles about coaches who allegedly write original speeches for their students. This essay argues that while such overcoachers are indeed acting unethically and uneducationally, their opposing number--undercoachers--are also acting undesirably. Perhaps most critically, both sets of coaches are acting unprofessionally. After breaking down the creative speech process into seven component parts, I suggest that there is a comfortable ground in between these two extremes, where a forensic coach can legitimately--and in a truly professional manner--contribute to a student's creative efforts without endangering either the student's learning process or any ethical boundaries.

THE GHOSTWRITER, THE *LAISSEZ-FAIRE* COACH, AND THE FORENSIC PROFESSIONAL: NEGOTIATING THE OVERCOACHING VS. UNDERCOACHING DILEMMA IN ORIGINAL CONTEST SPEECHES

James J. Kimble[1]
Director of Forensics
George Mason University, Fairfax, VA

> No one but the most unscrupulous openly defends the practice of using ghostwritten material in a contest calling for original work (p. 65).
> -Faules, Rieke & Rhodes (1976)

> . . . ghostwriting [is] a fact of life in most contest events (p. 9)
> -Madsen (1984)

The increasing maturity of forensic activities in the United States has prompted growing attention to the development of the forensic professional. Ziegelmueller and Parson (1984), for example, suggest that "forensic educators are required to fulfill a number of differing professional roles, among them the role of classroom teacher, program administrator, and student advisor" (p. 37). Similarly, Bartanen (1993, p. 4) relates that the Guild of American Forensic Educators believes that "forensic programs should be directed by professional educators trained in both the philosophy and practice of the activity."

As individual events coaches and directors striving to become better at what we do, most of us at this developmental conference naturally fall under this increasing focus on professionalism in forensics. Indeed, this session is evidence that at least a few people are interested in the issue. Unfortunately, while we talk about professionalism in terms of tenure, research, degrees, and departmental status, we tend to give too little attention to the mechanics of actual coaching, the activity that is at the heart of our profession.

Although the act of coaching is obviously an individualized activity in which we each utilize our gifts (and exercise our biases), I believe that there is sufficient room for discussions of professionalism in coaching. In particular, I believe that there is merit in wrestling as a group with the thorny issues involved in appropriately guiding our students through the competitive season.

The subject of coaching individual events in a professional manner could encompass several possible issues. In this essay I shall focus on the issue of originality in public address events. In particular, I contend that the individual events professional can find ample, defined middle ground between the extremes of the *Laissez-Faire* coach and the Ghostwriter. I shall advance this argument in three separate sections: 1) a discussion of the overcoaching vs. undercoaching dilemma coaches of original public events face; 2) a delineation of seven steps involved in creating an original memorized speech in competitive forensics; and 3) a suggested set of specific norms to guide coaches as they negotiate these seven steps in a professional manner.

---

[1] AUTHOR'S NOTE: The author thanks Matt Davis for sharing his thoughts on this issue, and Dan West for his encouragement and patience.

Overcoaching vs. Undercoaching

The rules and guidelines of organized forensics indicate that public address speeches are to be "original." Most of us interpret this word to mean that the speeches are to be written by the competitor and no one else, and we strenuously object to any coach or team violating that expectation. But there is little doubt that the practice of handing students speech scripts authored by others has appeared in forensics contests, either through the efforts of the overly helpful coach (Kalanquin, 1989) or the outright rules violator (Madsen, 1984). Many of us, in fact, have heard--or have ourselves contributed to--negative gossip about teams or individuals who may have crossed that line.

Variously called "ghostwriting" or "overcoaching," the extreme forms of this practice (at least) are clearly against the rules, and are also poor educational practice. Previous treatments of the subject, which are relatively sparse, are often blunt in their disapproval. Ulrich (1986, p. 134), for instance, argues that "coaching efforts should supplement, not substitute for, student efforts." Madsen (1984, p. 10) agrees, adding that

> . . . if we believe that students must, in fact, learn to do research, to organize materials, to present ideas with clarity and to come to appreciate historical data and good literature, then we . . . will be offended by ghostwriting, be it by a fellow student or an overly helpful coach.

Since the event called declamation is not offered at the college level, most of us would agree with these writers in their blunt assessments of those who overcoach and who, in the process, end up ghostwriting public address speeches for their students. Yet acting as a laissez-faire coach--one who gives his or her students as little direction as possible--is also problematic. Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes (1976, p. 65) agree, reminding us that a coach working with an original event speaker "need not refrain from making suggestions. If she has an idea that will improve a work, she should mention it to the student." And Derryberry argues that "the forensic educator needs to consistently monitor and scrutinize the substance of arguments within student speeches as events are created for competition" (1993, p. 7).

Unfortunately, without such assistance our students can and often will become victimized. As Faules and Rieke comment in their first edition (1968, p. 81),

> to expose certain students to audiences or to competition without adequate guidance may be seriously harmful to them, for an undirected or poorly prepared student is much more likely to find the speech situation to be traumatic than is a well-instructed one.

Indeed, many of us here have had the uncomfortable experience of judging a competitor who has apparently had no coaching advice whatsoever. If you have had that experience, I suspect you'll agree with me when I contend that such undercoaching is as poor a pedagogical choice as is overcoaching.

Here lies a dilemma, then, facing the coach who hopes to act in a professional manner. On the one hand, we enjoy watching our students succeed competitively, and the professional esteem that often accompanies that success. In that spirit we can blind ourselves--or rationalize to ourselves--to the point where we cross the line into overcoaching. On the other hand, we don't want to risk cheating, or even being perceived as cheating, so we convince ourselves that a few clueless tournaments will build character in our students. Thus we gain room--with professional pride intact--to cast stones at those who we suspect are ghostwriting.

Yet that point where the speech is no longer the student's--when it is, in Bormann's (1961, p. 267) words, at the place "where the speech changes character . . . from what it would have been had the speaker prepared the speech for himself"--remains definitionally elusive, even to those of us who are paid to adjudicate such presentations. In Thomas and Hart's (1983) survey, 69.8% of judges thought that for a hypothetical coach to provide outline, research, and final editing for a contestant's original speech was a definite ethical violation. However, 20.6% thought it was only questionable behavior and 7.9% didn't think it was an ethical violation at all. Students, meanwhile, were 69.5% sure there was an ethical violation in that situation, 23.2% sure the behavior was questionable, and 6.3% sure that it was fine. Adding to this confusion, one judge responded that a "coach-written oration is 'not unethical for beginners'" (p. 93). And Thomas and Hart themselves suggest that there is a potential gulf between what respondents feel in the abstract and how they would evaluate a specific, real-life instance.

With such a variety of viewpoints and potential exceptions it becomes easy to believe Kalanquin when she argues that "it is nearly impossible to recognize when the encouragement, suggestion, or assistance offered by an IE coach becomes too helpful" (1991, p. 91). Regrettably, the advice in our textbooks offers little help on the issue because it resorts to platitudes, as in Faules, Rieke and Rhodes' (1976, p. 82) statement that "the coach must determine the appropriate degree of assistance . . . [and] in making this determination the coach should avoid providing too much or too little assistance." Conversation among coaching and judging peers, finally, offers little help because the subject appears to be somewhat alarming as a conversation starter in the coaches' lounge.

Given this dilemma, and the little concrete guidance available to help us through it, this essay offers its own approach. I present what I believe is a relatively novel concept: not that there are sub-steps to creating an original public address speech, but that the level of coaching assistance that is professionally acceptable varies from step to step. Let me begin with the steps.

Seven Steps in Original Speech Creation

If we fail to think of the creation process involved in an original public address speech as having component steps, we mystify the process and there is thus little wonder that we have trouble telling how much coaching is too much and how much is too little. But as we know from our public speaking courses there are several steps one must take in creating a speech. By considering a forensic original event in this light it becomes possible to see that varying levels of coaching assistance are appropriate at different points in the creative process.

Although I won't claim that my version of these steps is the definitive one, I hope what follows will be useful as a starting point for the larger discussion of coaching in a professional manner. The steps are:

1. Choice of topic: selection of the speech's subject from among several possibilities.

2. Brainstorming: generating as many ideas (including concepts, potential jokes, main points, puns, and points of view) as possible about the chosen topic, and selecting some of these ideas as better than others.

3. Research: finding authoritative or anecdotal ideas about the chosen topic, ordinarily from published sources.

4. Organization: outlining and otherwise arranging elements of the speech, including elements from both brainstorming and research.

5. Composition: writing or typing out early versions of the speech--following the organizational pattern and using ideas from brainstorming and research--to create an edit-able manuscript.

6. Editing: re-organizing, re-working, re-arranging and/or re-focusing a manuscript version of the speech.

7. Polishing: refining and/or improving an edited version of the speech; a.k.a. "tweaking."

Obviously, these steps will hardly ever take place as literally discernible units. One reason is that our approaches will vary from student to student as we go through versions of these steps for each speech we coach. Another reason is that almost all of us will find ourselves sending a student back to the library after a speech has been in competition, wanting them to re-focus the speech or even just to find more up-to-date information. The process, in other words, can at some point become cyclic, and certainly idiosyncratic.

Yet identifying and explicating these steps is useful if only in establishing a vocabulary with which we can talk about professionally responsible levels of coaching. Just looking at the list, for instance, may suggest to some that the "composition" step is where most of their concern about ghostwriting exists; to these individuals the coach who literally assigns a topic to a student is not at all objectionable, as long as he or she doesn't proceed to actually write out the speech. Others might have little problem with a coach who polishes a student-edited speech, but would be upset if the coach did the earlier editing step by themselves. In any case, using these terms in this discussion enables me to offer the following suggested set of specific norms for coaches hoping to negotiate these steps in a professional manner.

Coaching the Seven Steps: A Proposal for Professional Educators

Jay VerLinden echoes some of my basic feelings about forensics when he says that "forensics is most negative when instructors lose sight of its role as an educational activity and perceive of it only in terms of competitive success (quoted in Schroeder, 1994, p. 12). We are, or should be, "educator-coaches" (paraphrasing Derryberry, 1993, p. 5). Being an educator-coach in forensics, I contend, involves avoiding the extremes of overcoaching and undercoaching; true educator-coaches neither write speeches for their students, nor do they throw the students into a tournament without significant guidance and advice on those events. Instead, true educator-coaches carefully negotiate the steps involved in creating original speeches, making sure that the speech is truly the student's creation, yet has had significant input from collaborative coaching sessions. Let me explicate this position using the previously-identified steps.

Let's first imagine the overcoached original speech. Taking the "most average" student and speech we can imagine, the overcoached speech, almost by definition, has had much more coaching contribution than student contribution. At each step along the creative process, for instance, the hypothetical coach at the first level of Table 1 is never doing less than seventy percent of the work, and even ninety percent of the composition and editing of the speech. The student's contribution, meanwhile, is minimal--he or she has had some input in the choice of topic and even the brainstorming phase, but the rest of the time contributes only ten percent of the effort. Even worse, the coach and student's combined effort--the time they have spent together, pooling their efforts, knowledge, and feelings about the speech--is almost nonexistent.

Arguably, this example is a paradigm case of the overcoached student; the coach has not literally ghostwritten the speech, but the student's level of involvement has been small enough to minimize most of the process's pedagogical benefits. While this student may well successfully compete with the speech, I suspect that most of us would agree that in truth its success would be empty, both educationally and ethically.

The undercoached student, on the other hand, has a different set of problems. As the second area of Table 1 suggests, this student's coach contributes almost nothing to the creative process. The coach has probably made a list of possible topics (thus, I estimate, twenty percent of the work under choice of topic) and has even spent some time with the student, talking about the choice of topics and brainstorming a few ideas. After that point, however, the student has been left largely alone to sink or swim, with the coach re-appearing to polish some of the transcript's grammar at the end of the process.

Again, not all undercoached speeches will look exactly like this one. But this student's speech serves as enough of a paradigm, I think, to accurately point out the perils of undercoaching. Not only has this coach not spent time looking over drafts of the student's efforts and making suggestions, but they've also spent almost no time with the student, contributing their knowledge about structure, source citation, word choice, or whatever else we pass along to our students when we act as professional educator-coaches.

At this point the common fault of both the overcoacher and the undercoacher should be obvious. Both spend too little time in the actual presence of the student. The overcoacher (ironically, given the label) is content to hand the student work the coach has done and to offer memorization tips, and even perhaps to work on delivery later in the semester. The undercoacher is content to let the student labor without guidance or advice, often producing a clueless competitor who is demoralized and victimized. Each coach, then, has faults peculiar to their style of coaching. But perhaps most critically from a pedagogical standpoint, neither of these coaches spends much quality time with their student, failing to work in a cooperative, symbiotic fashion so that the student learns at the same time the student creates.

These examples of the overcoacher and the undercoacher set the stage for the final student in Table 1. This student, I contend, is neither overcoached nor undercoached. Instead, the coach contributes in significant ways to the student's speech where the coach's contribution is the most educational, and contributes much less when the student's solo work is the most educational. I believe, in short, that this is a student who has learned both from the coach and from the creative process.

Therefore--subject to the caveats I list below--I contend that this coaching effort is the only one of the three that is most likely to be working in a professional manner.

The specific contributions of coach and student are markedly different for this third pair. For the choice of topic phase, the coach has actually done most of the work, perhaps spending the summer creating a list of possible topics; the coach and student have also spent time together discussing possible topics, and the student has spent additional time alone, reflecting on the choice. Of course, the advanced student would very likely spend proportionally more time choosing their speech topic than in this example, but even for skilled students this coach doesn't seem to me to be contributing more than is educationally sound.

In the brainstorming phase the coach's solo effort dramatically decreases and the student's significantly increases, as does their time spent together. Here the coach may have appended a list of possible angles or directions to take with a given speech topic, and then worked through a coaching session with the student in which they both generated possible ideas for the speech and its direction. The student, however, has done fifty percent of the work at this stage on their own, perhaps expanding on the original, collaborative pool of ideas. Advanced students, again, would perhaps spend even more solo time at this phase of the creative process.

When the student reaches the middle steps their share of the overall responsibility increases dramatically. In the research step the coach's solo contribution time sinks to ten percent (perhaps the initial article or series of columns that sparked the original idea in the coach's mind), while the coach's and student's time together remains about the same (perhaps time spent together identifying database search words, or reading together through a pile of articles to identify likely areas of support for the speech) and the student's time alone in the library stacks or in front of the computer search terminal increases even more to around seventy percent. The organizational phase is similar, with the student present at least ninety-five percent of the on-task time, while the composition step also exhibits extremely little solo contribution from the coach while the student has significant responsibility for almost all of the work.

In the editing and polishing steps the coach's contributions again become somewhat more significant. In researching, organizing, and compiling the speech, the student has created a transcript which is now suitable for attention from the coach. I've suggested that this coach spends around thirty percent of the overall editing time working over the transcript alone (writing comments in margins, drawing arrows, crossing out word choices, etc.), and another thirty percent with the student explaining those choices, then asking the student to spend the remaining forty percent of the editing effort on their own. Once the editing phase changes into a polishing phase, the coach's share of the work load is again similar, working over the transcript alone, then working with the student before sending the student off to finish the polishing process on their own.

Throughout these seven steps, this third coach/student pair has spent a significant amount of time together, and at only one point--generating possible topics--has this coach spent more time on a step than the student has. Perhaps more importantly, the coach and the student have shared work time every step along the way. While the character of this work time is obviously important (if the student is just witnessing the coach work without comment or contribution, then that time's educational value is much more in question), this time together is a critical component of the educational process I'm advocating.

In comparison with the other students, then, this third student has successfully balanced their own creative work with the coach's contributions, as well as their time together. The first two coaches have acted irresponsibly and unethically; this third coach has carefully negotiated the extremes of student guidance, acting in a responsible, and ethical manner. In short, the first two coaches have acted unprofessionally and the third, presumably, has acted in a professional manner. I say "presumably" in the last sentence because the third coach still has the potential to be acting unprofessionally. I've suggested these percentage allocations are indicative of professional behavior, but I don't believe they're causal. In fact, along with my proposed coaching norms, embodied in the bottom of Table 1, I now add several caveats to help make the negotiation of the seven steps clearer:

1. No matter what percentages of effort apply in a given case, the student must always be able to honestly believe that the speech's authorship is indeed the student's.

2. Following Derryberry (1993), the educational value of the time spent by student and coach together is likely to be proportional to the level of Platonic-style instruction the coach uses (i.e., the coach's instruction should be more interrogatory than directive).

3. The coaching process should always aim for educational value over competitive success. (Note, however, that these two goals can and often are compatible.)

4. The percentages of effort in Table 1 are intended more as paradigmatic examples of a hypothetical "average" coaching session than as rule-bound dicta; real-life coaching of specific speeches will obviously diverge to greater or lesser extents from my example, based on the student's level of experience, the coach's technique in coaching, the topic chosen, and so on.

Conclusion

By combining the hypothetical coaching example in Table 1 with the above caveats, I hope that I've made a clear case for responsible coaching by professional educator-coaches. It may well be that my argument here is controversial. In fact, I hope it is, for it is time we started talking about these issues, rather than watching a few colleagues over the years raise them in the face of polite silence.

The mistake of those writers, in my opinion, was their focus on ethics. While most of us would agree that ethics in forensics is a good idea, when it comes time to adapt them to an issue we falter. And yet we keep clamoring for that elusive code (Kalanquin, 1989, Madsen, 1984, Ulrich, 1984).

My approach has been to focus not on the ethical but on the professional. If we think of the issues surrounding overcoaching vs. undercoaching as ethical concerns we will inevitably get caught up in a "whose ethics?" debate. But to see this issue as one in which we can behave professionally, or not . . . well, if it doesn't avoid the debate at least it will get us talking.

References

Bartanen, M. D. (1993). Coaches corner: The educational objectives of the Guild of American Forensic Educators. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 78(2), 1-11.

Beetham, P. C. (1985). Are debate handbooks proper educational materials for high school debates-con?. Paper presented at the National Forensic League Conference on the State of High School Debate, Kansas City, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 470)

Bormann, E. G. (1961). Ethics of ghostwritten speeches. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 48, 262-267.

Derryberry, B. R. (1993, November). Developing ideas through forensics. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Miami, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 366 999)

Faules, D. F., & Rieke, R. D. (1968). Directing forensics: Debate and contest speaking. Scranton, PA: International Textbook.

Faules, D. F., Rieke, R. D., & Rhodes, J. (1976). Directing forensics: Debate & contest & debate speaking (2nd ed.). Denver: Morton.

Kalanquin, P. (1989). Have we been offering too much help? In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.), Perspective on individual events: Proceedings of the first developmental conference on individual events (pp. 90-93). Mankato, MN: Mankato State.

Madsen, S. (1984). Ethical considerations in building a forensic program. Storm Lake, IA: Buena Vista College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 318)

Schroeder, A. B. (1994, November). The administrative view of the educational perspectives in forensics activities for the 21st century. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 823)

Ulrich, W. (1984). The ethics of forensics. In D. Parson (Ed.), American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics (pp. 13-22). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Ziegelmueller, G., & Parson, D. W. (1984). Strengthening educational goals and programs. In D. Parson (Ed.), American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics (pp. 37-48). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Table 1

Percent of Student, Coach, and Combined Work on an Original Speech, Varying by Coach Input (Paradigm Examples)

Steps in creative process

Contributor	TOP	BRN	RCH	ORG	CMP	EDT	PSH
Overcoached student							
Student	20	.20	.10	.10	.10	.10	.10
Coach	.70	.70	.80	.80	.90	.90	.90
Combined	.10	.10	.10	.10	.00	.00	.00
Undercoached student							
Student	.70	.80	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.90
Coach	.20	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.10
Combined	.10	.20	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
Coach guides student through steps							
Student	.15	.50	.70	.75	.75	.40	.40
Coach	.75	.30	.10	.05	.05	.30	.30
Combined	.10	.20	.20	.20	.20	.30	.30

Note. The seven stages abbreviated above are: choice of topic; brainstorming; research; organization; composition; editing; polishing.

ABSTRACT: In dealing with the topic of Professionalism and Forensics, much has been said about the various elements that go into the making of a forensic educator. This paper examines these elements by relating the choices that are involved in this educational activity. Opinions, probes, and questions are presented to challenge those involved in the education of a forensic professional to be aware of the choices that must be faced in determining the direction of a career and program in forensic education.

PROFESSIONALISM AND FORENSICS
A MATTER OF CHOICE

Larry Schnoor
Director of Forensics
St. Olaf College, Northfield, MN

Bryant K. Alexander
Doctoral Candidate
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL

When the subject of "Professionalism and Forensics" was first suggested, we were not exactly sure just what direction to take. After all, the terms could have so many different meanings, and to select just one, might suggest that it was the most important. In attempting to narrow our focus, we decided that by putting our collective experiences in forensics together, we would come up with over 50 years of experience in forensics, including time as competitors, coaches, and directors of forensic programs. And since we are on the edge of the millennium, it only seemed appropriate to examine this topic from several perspectives. Many papers at this conference have continued the inquiry into the questions and concerns that have been raised by many throughout the past several decades. To echo the words of the Keynote Address to the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta Professional Development Conference (Schnoor, 1995), as we approach the turn of the century, it is time that we take stock of just what we are about, what has been said about forensics, and what we need to consider for the millennium ahead. In this examination, references to various studies, to various conversations from discussions at tournaments and via the internet, to personal opinions, will be used to put forth what we feel are the important issues to consider. We do not pretend to have the answers. We do not pretend to be prescriptive. But we do contend that the future of forensics will be shaped as to how these issues are handled, shaped, delivered, and executed.

This conference has on its agenda sessions concerned with the training of coaches and judges, standards of evaluation and judging, new directions for oral interpretation, public speaking, parliamentary and Lincoln-Douglas debate, tournament management, and a general session on the all encompassing topic of professionalism and forensics. One would hope that each of the sessions would address the factor of professionalism as it is related to all of the areas from participation, coaching, judging, tournaments and the results of a forensic education and what is carried away from the involvement in forensic activities. It is not our purpose to address all of the issues that may have already been put forth during the last day and a half. Rather, we will attempt to ask some questions, do some probing, and hopefully, center attention upon areas that seem to be of concern to the forensic community.

As we continue along this pathway of examination, it is clear that many of the issues before us are the same as were here in 1986. The same issues being recycled, with a few new changes, but the same base of concern. The training and education of coaches and judges has been an issue since the first debate coach was hired by a university back in 1905. Since that point in time, numerous studies and positions have been taken on the program that should be followed. In every case, mention is made that the forensic educator should be well informed of the developments in the field. One of the best references that could be helpful for a new forensic educator, as well as for one that has been in the field, would be to check the bibliography complied by Steven Hunt (Hunt, 1996). Another excellent source would be to review what Douglas Ehninger called the "Six Earmarks of a Sound Forensics Program," back in 1952. (Ehninger, 1952). Perhaps one of the more interesting presentations along this line was from Grace Walsh in her article "Nine Steps in A Good Forensics Program" published in 1958 (Walsh, 1958).

As one examines these past references that are related to the education and training of a forensic professional, one begins to develop the sense of longevity that is necessary in our field. This sense of longevity is what helps to provide stability at the same time we are looking for changes and new developments in how we want to go into the future. This sense of longevity is what is needed, as we can learn from what has been proposed in the past, what has been tried, and what still needs to be considered. Without a sense of longevity, we tend to be like a ship without any rudder, floating on a sea of ideas but with no sense of direction as we do not know where we have been, so how can we know where we want to go. In determining where we want to go, we must realize that we shall have to make choices. It is the choices made by an educator that have impact upon the individual career for that person, as well as for the students in the program, and in the long run, the direction of forensics in the future. These choices need to be considered in the areas of the forensic season, the tournaments selected, the training, education and ethics of coaches and students, and finally, in the development of forensic events.

Let us first consider the discussion on the length of the forensic season. During the past several years, much has been put forth about how the season is much too long and should be shortened. This past spring, numerous opinions were put forth on the internet. Each opinion offered valid reasons, as far as the writer of the opinion was concerned. No real conclusion was developed, but the discussion did present all an opportunity to vent their frustrations. Only a few of the comments offered put forth the element of "choice" as it relates to this issue. In a professional sense, forensic education should enable both coaches and students to learn how to make a choice, based upon what is best for them, for their performance, for their program. After all, isn't that what is required in the professional world? The ability to make choices upon a full examination and consideration of evidence is valued highly in the business world which most of our graduates will enter. This discussion is also the subject of numerous papers which will be presented at this year's NCA convention in Chicago. There can be no question that for some the season is too long, and for others, it may be too short. We do not advocate any particular position, other than the decision is a professional one that should be left to those that are in the best position to make the decision, based upon their professional needs and considerations, both for them and for their students.

This factor of "choice" may also be related to the tournaments selected to attend, all the way from the regular season tournaments to the nationals at the end of a season. During the regular season, choices are made as to which state, regional or national level tournaments to attend. In some cases, this choice is based on how nationally competitive the objective is for a forensic program. In others, it is to support programs in order to make sure that programs continue in a particular geographical area. In still other cases, the choice of tournaments attended is based on the cost and the return received for that cost.

In the case of which end of season nationals to attend, choice must also be made. Many programs are affiliated with a national fraternal organization such as PKD, DSR-TKA, or Phi Rho Pi. It may be their professional choice that the fraternal national tournament is the best for their program. Others may select to attend one of the other nationals, such as NPDA, NDT, CEDA, AFA-NIET, NFA or even Interstate. That too is their choice. The point here is that each program, each director of a program, needs to make this choice based on what is best for the overall program at the respective school and what is best for the students in that program. There are numerous other programs throughout the nation that make the choice not to attend any national tournament of any kind. Granted, the choices may be based on a variety of factors, but we must not forget that they are "professional" choices and should be respected as such by all of us. These translate into the professional choices that need to be made outside the academic practice of forensics as well. Our students should be involved in these choices, understanding the reasons and economics for each choice, so they too will gain the skills of decision making in a practical sense, which they can carry with them upon graduation.

Whatever is put forth about the training required for a forensic educator, it must be remembered that the same should be required for any educator.. What has this to do with the element of "choice?" Each of us must make choices everyday. For instance, the "choice" of whether to remain in the field of forensics or not. We are well aware of those studies that have indicated that many choose not to remain in the field for one reason or another (Bartanen, 1996; Gill, 1990; Jensen, 1993). In some cases, those that choose to leave may do so because they are not really that interested in being a forensic educator, in others it may be due to tenure reasons, still others may choose to leave because of family reasons or whatever.

The point to be made is that it is a factor of "choice" that is involved. Why the choice was made and what was considered in making that choice may never be clear to anyone except the person making the choice.

Also involved in the training of the forensic educator is the element of ethics. It is certainly clear to all of us in attendance at this conference, that we believe there is an "ethical" standard that is related to being a forensics professional. Yet, think of the number of times the question of "ethics" comes up in discussions at tournaments, at conventions, and at conferences such as this. During our tenure as forensic professionals, we have heard numerous rumors related to this coach or that coach, this student or that student, all of which center around questions of "ethics." For instance, what about the "choice" a forensic educator makes by allowing a student to continue to compete when the student's grade point average is at question? Are we doing that student a service? What about the "choice" a forensic educator makes by writing original material to use in interpretative events for students to use, not because the student cannot find material, but because the coach knows that the student will be able to win with this material? Or the coach that writes the orations or rhetorical criticisms or after dinner speeches. All of these are based on the matter of "choice." Our students are aware of the choices we make. What messages are we sending to them with these practices?

When we consider the development of new directions for any of our activities, be they oral interpretation, public speaking, or debate, we need to be clear in our minds as to why we are advocating these developments, these choices. It has been interesting to listen to the discussion over the years on experimental events designed to present some new directions. In that discussion we have heard numerous reasons why the event would be advantageous for the education of students. We have also heard numerous reasons why events should not be adopted or tried--and here is the interesting twist. The reasons that were advanced dealt with what it would do to possibly give some area of the country a better chance of winning, rather than being based on any educational objections. Even when it has been suggested that an experimental event would be worthwhile, the only way it could be included in a tournament schedule, would be if some present event were dropped. The objection to dropping an event has been mostly based on what it would do to the competition from the standpoint of winning, rather than from an educational perspective. What does this say about the "choices" we make as professional forensic educators? Do we always model the behavior and ethics to which we give lip service, or do our behavior and actions send a mixed message? These are questions only each of us can answer as we examine ourselves, our behaviors, our actions, our ethics.

What can we use to help us in this quest, in this time of choices that must be made? Harold L. Lawson presented four questions in 1994 (Lawson, 1994). In his Keynote Address to the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta Development Conference, Schnoor put forth twelve questions one may utilize in making sure the forensics program is based on an educationally sound philosophy of forensics (Schnoor, 1995). In both cases, the authors' views clearly put forth the element of choices needed to be made in this examination and determination. We suppose that some could avoid these choices because, inwardly, they may not like the answers or conclusions that would be forthcoming. Others may not make these choices because of external pressure. And that in itself is a choice--a choice to allow such pressures to direct the program and activity.

As we face the year 2000, we must remember that each of us are challenged to develop criteria by which to make choices and to develop criteria by which to analyze problems and situations that will allow our students to enter the careers of their choice with a sound professional background, not only of forensics, but also of the general nature of ethics by which to operate. The claim has been put forth on numerous occasions, that forensics programs should exist because forensic participation prepares students for the academic and professional world. We need to make sure that our programs do more then just train our students to take our place in the academic world, to follow in our footsteps. We need to make sure that the qualities, procedures, policies, and practices we choose in our programs are those that our students can carry with them into the professional world. In this matter of determination, we may discover that our behaviors, our choices, our ethics, have been counterintuitive to the professionalism that we claim this activity fosters. It may be a painful examination, but it is one that must be completed for each of us that claims to be a "professional forensic educator."

References

Bartanen, M.D. (1994). Teaching and directing forensics. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick Publishers.

Ehninger, D. (1952). Six earmarks of a sound forensics program. Speech Teacher, 1, 237-241.

Gill, M. (1990). Why forensics coaches quit: A replication and extension. National Forensic Journal, 8, 179-188.

Hunt, S. B. (1996). A select partially annotated bibliography for directing forensics: Teaching, coaching and judging debate and individual events. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 81, 141.

Jensen, S. L. (1996, November). Unifying research and teaching pedagogy for the transition from forensics competition to education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

Lawson, H. L. (1994). Four steps toward a philosophy of forensics. Speech and Theater Association of Missouri Journal, 51-60.

Schnoor, L. & Karns, V. (Eds.). (1989). Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Mankato, MN: Mankato St. University Press.

Schnoor, L. (1995). What direction are we traveling? Keynote Address to the 1995 Pi Kappa Delta Professional Development Conference, March 22, 1995. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 80, 2-7.

Walsh, G. (1958). Nine steps in a good forensics program. Central States Speech Journal, 35-37.

CREATING SPACE FOR THE PHYSICALLY CHALLENGED COMPETITOR IN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS

David L. Kosloski
Director of Forensics
Hastings College, Hastings, NE

Current research regarding the integration of students with disabilities into public school classrooms has implications for all who educate, including the forensics coach and critic. While it has been demonstrated that physical access and equal educational opportunity can be legislated, experts generally agree that complete integration and acceptance of students with disabilities will happen only if as much attention is given to attitudinal barriers (Beattie, Anderson, & Antonak, 1997; Jones, 1984). Extensive research has shown that the attitudes of educators toward students with disabilities are crucial to their overall integration into the educational institution. Positive attitudes toward physically challenged students, for example, encourage new policies to be developed and help to increase the allocation of the resources necessary to increase integration. Negative attitudes, on the other hand, reinforce expectations of low achievement and inappropriate behavior by students with disabilities (Airman, 1981; Jamieson, 1984). The findings of the most recent research in this area (Beattie, Anderson, & Antonak, 1997) suggest that teachers who see physically challenged students functioning successfully in educational settings perceive themselves to be more successful in dealing with such students and thus, express more favorable attitudes toward their overall integration.

Recently I have written about the challenges of creating a space for physically challenged students in individual events competition (Kosloski, 1994). My research suggests that attitudes and inexperience among coaches and critics are preventing the total integration of physically challenged students into the forensics activity. Many coaches have admitted that while they will not discourage students with disabilities from participating in forensics, certain barriers make such participation difficult, if not impossible. These barriers include budget constraints, building/room accessibility, transportation, peer rejection, and judging concerns, among others. While increasing gender and minority diversity in forensics has recently been given much needed attention in the forensics community little attention has been given to the issue of physically challenged students in forensics. Yet their integration is important to the idea of total diversity in forensics.

It might be useful to begin addressing some of the concerns raised in a recent questionnaire on physically challenged students in forensics. I am particularly interested in discussing how judging criteria is applied to the physically challenged student. My research has shown that when forensics coaches responded to the question, "Do you have concerns as a judge about evaluating a physically challenged student in competition?", 25% expressed some concern. These were some of the typical comments:

> "[I am concerned] that judges subconsciously grant to challenged students more lee-way or credit for performance beyond whatever allowances must be taken into account--the 'sympathy' ballot."
>
> "I wonder if I'm being too hard or too forgiving for some individuals. Take persuasion, delivery is obviously an important element and, everything being equal a . . . (traditional) student who has movement and the ability to stand would have some advantage over a student confined to a wheelchair."
>
> "Judging a student with cerebral palsy was a challenge because it was difficult to tell how much control he had over his motor skills. Thus, I was hesitant . . . to comment on his excessive use of hand gestures."
>
> "In the case of the hearing-impaired student, the only category not applicable is vocal quality--should it count that much? . . . [At] a tournament the student 'signed' the speech while the interpreter sat, in the audience, back-to-the-judge, and [vocally] interpreted the speech."
>
> "It was never a problem for me because I am very open-minded. However, I must admit when I judged the girl in duo interpretation doing 'Children of a Lesser God' and found out she was really deaf, I felt a bit cheated. I felt perhaps she had an unfair advantage."

These salient concerns offer us a point of entry for a discussion on how successfully the forensics activity is integrating physically challenged competitors. At issue for the coach is how a judge's decision can help or hinder a physically challenged student in their desire to continue to participate in forensics. At issue for the physically challenged competitor is how judging decisions impact their self-esteem and confidence. And, at issue for the critic is how to be fair in applying certain criteria to both physically challenged and traditional competitors.

The following are some questions that I hope will foster discussion on this issue:

1. Do current delivery expectations in competition hinder the challenged competitor?

2. Should all competitors be held to the same standard when evaluating platform movement, gestures, and vocal expression?

3. A student with Tourette's Syndrome or cerebral palsy may shake or twitch uncontrollably during competition. How should that student be evaluated against other "traditional" performances in the round?

4. A student with a degenerative muscle condition or nerve disorder may have a slightly slurred vocal style or a slower rate of speech than others in the round. How should that competitor be evaluated in comparison to the other performances?

5. Should a visually impaired student be required to use a black book in interpretation events?

6. Should the competitor who is confined to a wheelchair be penalized when visual aids seem clearly necessary in an informative speech?

7. Research shows that most forensics administrators believe that education is the key to successful integration of physically challenged students into our activity. How is that accomplished?

8. Are traditional (without disabilities) competitors disadvantaged when delivery is discounted for a physically challenged competitor in a round?

9. Is it ever justified to discourage a physically challenged student from competing? What disabilities might be considered too severe for this activity?

10. How do coaches prepare the physically challenged student for "healthy" competition? How does a coach interpret ballot decisions for the student after competition?

Works Cited

Airman, B. M. (1981). Studies of attitudes toward the handicapped: The need for new direction. Social problems, 28, 321-337.

Beattie, J. R., Anderson, R. J., & Antonak, R. R. (1997). Modifying attitudes of prospective educators toward students with disabilities and their integration into regular classrooms. Journal of Psychology, 131, 245-260.

Jamieson, J. D. (1984). Attitudes of educators toward the handicapped. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), Attitudes and attitude change in special education: Theory and practice. (pp. 206-222). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Jones, R. L. (Ed.). (1984). Attitudes and attitude change in special education: Theory and practice. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Kosloski, D. L. (1994). Considering the role of the physically challenged student in individual events competition. National Forensic Journal, 11, 37-46.

CREATING AN INDIVIDUAL EVENTS JUDGING PHILOSOPHY

Jeff Przybylo
William Rainey Harper College, Palatine, IL

What is an I.E. Judging Philosophy? It is a series of written statements concerning how the judge views Individual Events in general, variables in each events, and views concerning decision-making. It is a tool that judges, coaches, and graduate assistants can use to develop their views and attitudes concerning judging criteria. In addition, it can serve as a discussion starter for forensics classes, conferences, and graduate assistant training sessions. It is not intended to be shared with competitors (as in debate).

As forensics judges we often let our moods, pet peeves, regional differences, coaching styles, ages, relationships, values, and political opinions cloud our vision while judging I.E. rounds. These things often keep us from doing our JOBS. Our job is to be objective, fair, open minded, educationally based, judges of communication. It is my position that creating a personal judging philosophy will aid judges in doing their jobs. This philosophy is created to help the individual judge determine how he/she will approach the act of judging I.E. rounds. Its content may be shared with others, however, it is intended to be used as a tool for decision making BEFORE a judge begins a season of judging.

A judging philosophy should not articulate a judge's world view (one's view on social issues and life in general), but instead should be a forensics view. It should answer the question, "What criteria do I use to make forensics decisions and why?"

A judging philosophy is dynamic or ever changing. Our views and criteria should develop as one grows as a judge and educator.

As judges and coaches, I believe that it is important to spend some time thinking and writing about WHY we judge the way we do. The I.E. judging philosophy will improve the "health" of individual events as well as serve as a tool to train graduate students and future coaches.

In addition, I strongly urge coaches who have graduate assistants to make this the student's first assignment as a member of the staff. The philosophy should be discussed and adjustments made so the philosophy is consistent with the program and individual's philosophy and goals. The philosophy should include a paragraph concerning the following topics. Additional topics can be added to suit your program's needs.

- A General Philosophy Statement (overall view of your positions)
What is your view of competition and the value of this activity? What is your focus? How do you approach a round?

- "Overdone" material/topics
How do you feel about overdone material and "old" topics? How do you evaluate these things?

- Different rules (NFA, AFA, Phi Rho Pi, etc.)
What rules do you use when judging? Do you adjust for the particular tournament?

- Listening behavior
How does a student's behavior as an audience member effect their rank/rate?

- Language (dirty words, sexist language, etc.)
What is your attitude toward language?

- Movement and Book-as-Prop (interpretation)
What is your attitude toward movement?

- Use of script (looking at the script)
To what degree should a student "use" the book?

- Current sources
What is your attitude toward current sources and how does it effect your rank/rate?

- Types of comments
What types of comments do you try to write? Do you "coach" on the ballot? Do you highlight the positive/negative? Do you justify the rank?

- Speaker points
What is lowest you will go? What is a "25?" What criteria do you use to assign speaker points?

- Organization of ballot
Do you organize your ballot in any way?

- Appearance
Does the student with the brand new power suit get the same rank as the student without one?

- Time violations
How and to what degree do you penalize for over/under time?

- A statement for *each* event
Each event has its controversial issues. For example, third person stories in prose, example speech vs. unified analysis in impromptu, value topics in persuasion, original interp material, movement in duo, etc. A judging philosophy could include a short paragraph concerning each event.

Appendix A - Sample Individual Events Judging Philosophy

Judging Philosophy
Jeff Przybylo
Harper College, Palatine, IL
July 1997

A General Philosophy Statement
Good is Good. I do not get caught up in trends or technical things.

I evaluate the performance *as a whole*. For example, I would never give a "6" because of one verbal slip or because of a single small problem.

When determining rank, I do not compare the performance to trends or things I have seen in the past. The only thing that I consider is the performances in *that round*. I judge in the moment. Past experiences have no bearing on my ranking. I MAY consider trends or things I have seen in the past when awarding speaker points and making comments. The only exception is when I suspect plagiarism.

I believe in competition. Competition is the *tool* coaches use to teach effective communication skills. It is our little "trick." Students do not typically come into the office and say, "Wow, teach me to research, write, organize, and appreciate literature!" They see a game or competition that looks like fun. As educators we must use fun to our advantage. As a coach I focus on the process and not the product. Therefore, I try to judge with the same mind set. It is my job as a judge to help the student with this particular stage of the learning process.

"Overdone" material/topics
Interp material should be of a college level and challenging (for the particular student). It should also have literary merit. The fact that somebody "did the piece before" has no bearing on my rank.

Public address topics should be timely, scholarly, creative, and research oriented. The fact that somebody "did the topic before" has no bearing on my rank.

Different rules (NFA, AFA, Phi Rho Pi, etc.)
I make a point of finding out what rules the tournament is following and judge according to those rules. If, for example, the tournament is using Phi Rho Pi rules then I will judge *Speech to Entertain* as *Speech to Entertain*. I will not apply *After Dinner Speaking* rules. This especially important when judging a community college tournament as well as high school tournaments. A judge must evaluate according to the rules of the tournament, NOT the rules he/she feels are "correct."

Listening behavior
Listening is equally important as speaking. Students who exhibit poor listening behavior will be "warned" on the ballot. The next time I observe the same student exhibiting poor listening skills his/her rank will be dropped. Poor listening behavior includes leaving early when the student is not double entered (or lying about being DE).

Language
Sexiest and foul language should be avoided unless it is being used to make an argument or is a vital part of a character's dialogue. Blue humor in ADS/STE is not considered scholarly.

Movement and Book-as-Prop (Interpretation)
Both are acceptable as long as they are purposeful. Movement and book-as-prop should "add to" the performance and not be used "to get better ranks."

Use of script
Students should acknowledge the literature. A student who ignores the literature (not looking at pages, blank script, etc.) will be penalized.

Current sources
Sources should support arguments in a timely and effective manner. If a topic does not call for sources from "this year" then so be it.

Types of comments
My comments on the ballot will reflect positive and negative aspects of the performance. My goal is to encourage the student while providing advice on how to improve the performance or speech. My ballots will end with a "justification of rank" statement.

Speaker points
On a 1-25 scale:
25 - for performances that are among the best I have ever seen.
24 - for performances that are among the best I have seen this year.
23 - for the number one ranked speaker in the round (if they do not meet the above criteria). I may start below 23 it if was an extremely weak round. I work down from there, never going below 15.

Organization of ballot
I organize my ballots into three columns; GOOD STUFF, THINGS TO WORK ON, and COMMENTS. An organized ballot is much easier for a student to read and use. Stream of conscious ballots (which most judges use) are confusing and often useless.

Prose
Should tell a "story." I look for a beginning, middle and end. Third person stories are acceptable and are judged no differently than first person stories.

Poetry
I look for understanding. And whether or not the student shares that understand with the audience. Programs and long poems are equal.

Drama & Duo
The focus should be on creating *character(s)* and bringing a play to life.

Impromptu & Extemporaneous Speaking
I believe that a unified analysis is a superior way to argue (number of points is irrelevant. 2 or 3 work fine depending on the topic). Example should be used as support for ideas, not as main points.

Persuasion
Value topics should be reserved for ADS or STE.
Problem-Cause-Solution is not the only way to organize a persuasive message. Other methods (as long as they are appropriate for the topic) are encouraged and celebrated.

Informative

Topics should be scholarly, creative and important to a general audience as well as society in general.

After Dinner Speaking

I discourage blue, sexist, or racist humor. The speech should be entertaining, have a solid structure, and provide a useful/motivational message.

CHALLENGING THE CONVENTIONS OF ORAL INTERPRETATION

Christopher S. Aspdal
University of Houston, Houston, TX

The forensic community is currently facing many difficult challenges. Many stigmas have been placed in the world of oral interpretation. The nature of oral interpretation is to educate students through the use of literature. Regardless of the literature used, students have the ability to grow from this material. However, we as coaches and judges have taken a more negative approach to this concept. Words such as *recycle* and *trite* have taken the place of more important words like *education* and *research*.

It is important for us to look at the reasons why we have taken this approach to oral interpretation and see what possible solutions we may be able to derive. Above all else, we need to remember that we are here to educate students and help them to achieve their goals (rather than ours). The following will examine some current issues facing the oral interpretation community and some possible solutions to these problems. Obviously, when looking at such a subjective event as oral interpretation, no group will ever reach a unanimous decision on how to solve these problems. Perhaps through examining these concerns, we may be able to provide for a more equal criteria for judging, and create less frustration and disappointment for competitive students.

Recycling Pieces

The question of using "recycled" material has raised many eyebrows. We, unfortunately, seem to have assumed a law in our forensic community that would prevent students from rehashing old performances. Before we go any further, it is probably necessary to define what exactly "recycling" means. When used in the area of competitive forensics, the idea of using a piece of literature that has previously been performed in competition (usually successfully) would be defined as recycling. The misconception behind recycled literature is two-fold.

Overused Material

If a piece of literature is found to traditionally be an enjoyable selection to perform, for whatever reason, then it is classified as *overused*. This is a term that suggests that the material's value of entertainment has been worn out. The attitude of listening to a piece that we have "heard a thousand times before" essentially becomes a negative label given to the literature itself.

Unfortunately, the educational value of the literature suffers equally from this label. Students should be allowed, for the sake of education, to review older pieces of literature and learn from them. There is, after all, a reason why they have been performed so many times. Either the literature is easy to learn, is fun and exciting or simply teaches an important lesson in oral interpretation. Regardless of the reason why a piece of literature is labeled as "overused," students should not suffer the consequences of performing literature that interests them.

National Material

The second misconception behind recycling pieces is a bit more questionable. The question is raised, if a piece of literature has been performed by an individual in a national break round, then should this piece become off limits to other students in the following years? The obvious answer to this question would appear to be no. However, all too often, it is seen on ballots and heard through the halls of universities at tournaments, that students should not be allowed to perform literature that has been "successfully" done. The belief seems to be either: (1) The literature could not possibly be improved on, or (2) The literature has "flown its course and should be laid to rest." In either situation, the student will eventually suffer from these prevailing attitudes.

Creative and artistic endeavors are what the oral interpretation community thrives upon. By limiting students such, we stifle the creative thought process. Additionally (and very important to note), many newer students will find material that strikes their attention and spend a great deal of time and effort in preparing and presenting pieces. However, once taken to competition, these students are told that their efforts are, essentially, a waste of time, due to the "recycling rule."

Students should be permitted to use their creative endeavors to cut and present material of any sort. There is not a specific rule claiming rights to individual pieces. This is to say that the cutting should likewise reflect the student's original work and not an "exact cutting and/or blocking" previously used. Judges should equally remove their personal views on a previously performed piece and evaluate according to the performance in the round.

It is important to note that in both instances of recycling material, many students do not necessarily know as much as we coaches do. When literature is discovered, we should encourage the educational process and allow students to grow from their performances, rather than be stifled by judging opinions. All too often, students have simply become frustrated and given up on forensics because of judgments made based on this recycling stigma. We should encourage students to do their best, and refrain from discouraging commentary.

Trite Topic

Similar to the recycling concept, another stigma falls on the realm of oral interpretation. Just as literary material is often labeled as overused, topics may be referred to as *trite* or *common*. The belief is that when we hear about a specific topic enough times, we become very tired of or desensitized to the subject and thus learn nothing further from it. Topics such as war, love, death and the infamous "gay AIDS" have been scrutinized on many a competitive weekend.

The problem with this philosophy comes in two parts. First, perhaps there *is* something new and innovative or interesting to derive from an overused topic, but we all too often miss it because we tend to tune out the performance as a whole. Secondly, students are here primarily for education. Programmed literature teaches us to utilize a full spectrum of student talents, to create logical links as well as creative cutting.

We should not assume that because we have heard "everything about a subject," that the student has. Students should be allowed to thrive and educate through their performances, and equally feel that they have accomplished just that. Stifling topics due to subject matter should be avoided. Coaches should always strive to teach their students unique and original ideas, this is one of the great aspects of oral interpretation. However, when a student does choose to perform a "common" topic, he/she should not be penalized.

Gender Specific Interpretation

Often it has been said that if a piece of literature is written for a specific gender, then the performer must be of the same gender as the character in the literature. This brings up the question of male vs. female role playing in oral interpretation. The idea suggests that students should remain true to a character at all costs, and the only way to insure that this is done is that a student must remain true to his or her sex.

The problem with this idea is that students become limited to the creative process. When a male student takes on the persona of a female, or vice versa, a certain degree of growth takes place. Students should be allowed to grow as performers and learn as much as they can about their abilities. No other forum of interpretive performance truly allows a student the opportunity to stretch beyond their limited boundaries and portray gender differences. As trite as this may sound, the fact remains that oral interpretation allows students to expand their limits and perform pieces that normally would not be considered.

As judges, we need to open our minds to the idea that oral interpretation is not acting (as I've heard all too often) and that we are therefore not limited to the boundaries set up by the stage. Gender shifts should be allowed to help students grow in their performances and learn more about themselves.

Cultural Sensitivity

When looking to the area of cultural sensitivity, we see similar parallels to gender specific interpretation. Essentially, the guiding force behind this philosophy is the same as gender oriented pieces. If a piece of literature is written for a specific race or culture (Hispanic, Caucasian, African American, Jewish, etc.) and the student is not of that background, or at least does not resemble the cultural persona, then he/she should avoid performing this literature. This idea appears the strongest when the piece directly focuses on the particular issue of race.

The problem here is that students should be encouraged to explore and study other cultures. Perhaps the best way to learn about a culture is to interact directly with the culture. So many times students have put a valiant foot forward in learning and getting involved with other cultures for the sake of learning more about their literature and performance technique. But this research comes to an end when, in performance, a coach or judge tells a student not to perform something due to the ethnic standard. "But you don't look Hispanic . . ." or, "That was offensive, how can you say this about a culture when you don't belong to it . . ." are words uttered to students on ballots over and over again.

If students are stifled in their performances, then so too is the educational process. It is important that we not only support, but also encourage students to expand their knowledge of other cultures. By doing so, we allow for a wider variety of performances as well as more rounded and open-minded students.

Assumed Formats

As a rule of thumb, oral interpretation events have gradually taken a path of general "assumed rules" and patterns to how specific events should be put together and judged. We seem to have moved away from the creative styles from which oral interpretation was developed and have now created general, evolutionary judging criteria. Such things as teaser/intros, social significance and performance formats have evolved from creative styles to expected norms. Judges have shifted from rewarding students for innovative concepts to "down ranking" students who fail to follow these new standards.

The major problem with these format criteria is that students, again, become limited in their creative means. If a student does not wish to follow a teaser/intro format for her prose, for whatever reason, then according to the assumed rules format, that student will probably suffer the consequences. Likewise, if a student chooses not to link a current event to his poetry program, then the same rules apply. By limiting people to assumed rules such as social significance or format structure, we begin to enforce our own personal beliefs into the individual's interpretation, thus not allowing for individual styles and preferences.

Yes, oral interpretation is, perhaps arguably, the most subjective of all forms of competitive speech. It is difficult to argue that one will almost always place his or her personal feelings and emotions into a well performed piece of literature, this is expected. However, objective judging, when following structure style and such, should not have a strict bearing. Obviously, objective concerns like time restraints, literary merit, and physical limitations will always have a role in judging. But "personal preferences" criteria should not reflect in ranking. Yes, mention these preferences to the student. Maybe he had never thought of it before, or perhaps he will adapt to his audience. There is nothing wrong with personal preferences in how an event "should" be performed, but do not hold this standard against a performance. Simply put, judge the performance of the piece, not how it is set up.

The Great Debates

Traditionally, oral interpretation has not been the subject of ridicule. Of course educators in the past have, and on some occasions still do, argue the value of oral interpretation as an educational practice. However, for the sake of argument, we will assume the standard of oral interpretation as an educational tool.

Recently it seems that coaches and judges have begun to question many of the alternatives that oral interpretation has taken. The current shifts in attitudes as well as coaching philosophies have conjured up several heated debates (hmm . . . oral interpretation and debate, two terms seldom used together). Unfortunately, these debates seem to have developed a split among oral interpretation coaches and judges, creating a traditionalist point of view and a non-traditionalist point of view. As a result, students performing oral interpretation have inadvertently been caught in the middle.

Arguments over such topics as first person prose vs. third person prose, dramatics performed as monologue vs. dialogue and programmed poetry vs. single piece poetry have been debated for years. It is important to note, though, that when looking at these issues, traditionalists and non-traditionalists alike tend to judge with an open mind and set personal preferences aside once in a round.

However, recent arguments have developed over the actual validity of students' performances. Questions such as "how far can we stretch the boundaries of oral interpretation" and "what qualifies a piece as having literary merit have developed?" These issues have taken a harder course in separating traditionalist and non-traditionalist opinions. It is essential that we address a few of these major debates and see the logical arguments taken on both sides. It is important to realize that we will not be able to reach any obvious conclusions to these issues is one sitting, but perhaps we may be able to gain a greater understanding of this split in attitudes and mend a few of these problems.

Acting vs. Interpretation

Perhaps one of the most frequent criticisms seen on ballots recently is the question of what defines the line between acting and interpreting literature? Certainly a book in hand does not solely justify oral interpretation, so we must look further into this argument. Probably the strongest argument defining the line between acting and oral interpretation is the creative motivation behind movement or the absence thereof.

Many traditionalists would argue that the basic premise for oral interpretation over acting is movement. Simply put, when interpreting literature, one should use one's voice and facial expressions to suggest emotions and character development. The art of movement suggests a stage. Interpreters should not freely move around, this is the nature of acting.

The antithesis of this would be the argument of blocking an interpretive performance. Non-traditionalists would argue creative motivations. As said, "We have progressed from basic standing, to allow a performer to utilize his surroundings and allow movement to set a scene." A performer may be able to express more emotion, or portray a greater feeling for the piece through "creative" blocking.

In either instance, movement has developed into an assumed "norm" by many. However, the debate continues over what is considered too much movement and what is acceptable.

Written Material

One of the greatest debates currently facing the forensic community is that of the use of written material. Many would argue that the use of written material promotes a lack in educational standards. Oral interpretation was originated to promote research and further study and reading from various outside authors. By performing one's own work, students fail to learn the value of adapting to different authors, as well as audiences. What this means is that when written material is performed, there is no room for interpretation, simply because the author is the interpreter. The search for creative interpretation and adapting to other authors becomes irrelevant, because the performer "already knows how the piece should be performed."

Essentially, a student can simply sit down and write all performed material, and the idea of research and learning through others is thus nil. Students should strive to find material for performance, whether new or old, and not take the easier approach of writing whatever they want.

On the other hand, written material promotes an interest in creative writing. Students are permitted to express their own opinions and emotions through the performance of their personal written words. Often times students will find a topic which they really wish to perform, but material is rare. Writing material provides a means of expressing views and ideas that may not have been addressed before. As we've seen with the "one piece" ruling on Programmed Oral Interpretation, written material does have some validity and should be considered as such.

Acceptable Language

A large question being raised now is that of what is acceptable language in performance pieces. The idea of using offensive language has always been a subject of controversy for many. A great many people feel that the use of harsh language is simply unacceptable and unnecessary. The following arguments show both sides of this issue.

Language allows us to hear the voice of the character. True emotions are expressed through words, often times harsh words. Oral interpretation allows the student one venue, and that is expression through words, thus interpretation. Therefore, as interpreters, a student must rely upon every avenue possible to enable him to express these emotions. One of these alternatives is through "foul" language. Others argue that this is just the way people will often times express themselves in "real life" and oral interpretation should reflect reality.

All too often, however, students feel that the use of language is a right and not a privilege. In other words, students take advantage of this use of expression and take it to an inappropriate level. This is what we refer to in the forensic community as "shock value." The attitude is that a student feels he has the right to use the language, thus forgetting the purpose behind this venue. Language becomes offensive and uncalled for because it is used inappropriately. Still many argue the logic that foul language is not acceptable in other realms of forensics like debate and public address, so why does it suddenly become acceptable for oral interpretation? In either instance, we are led to the question, should we cut out all questionable language since some students take advantage of this privilege? And if we do this, where do we begin to censor what is and isn't questionable language (a long argued debate in and of itself)?

After all the discussion, we still seem to be left with the question, what do we intend to do to "clean up" oral interpretation. Above all else, we must understand that we are educators, and students look to us for guidance in all aspects. We must encourage success through knowledge, rather than through competition. Whether the student is a member of your team or someone else's, the primary goal for all of us should be to educate. Trophies and awards are nice--this is the nature of competition--but if this is our only focus, then we have not succeeded.

It is important to collapse the differences within our community so that students may have the opportunity to grow as performers. When we remain stagnant in disagreement, then students will remain stagnant in the learning process. If a performer is told weekend after weekend that his piece is wrong due to personal issues rather than logical reasoning, that student will never grow, or worse (as seen many, many times) become frustrated and simply quit.

Let us challenge ourselves to bring a standard of equality in performance. Avoid the personal preference judging philosophy as best as possible, and encourage students to strive for excellence, and more so, to educate through performance.

RETURNING TO OUR ROOTS:
A NEW DIRECTION FOR ORAL INTERPRETATION

Trischa Knapp
Director of Forensics
Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR

The text is dead--but not in some twist of Postmodern logic. Rather, an examination of current competitive oral interpretation practices reveals that, indeed, the text is dead in competitive forensics. Many texts in oral interpretation have been sacrificed to the idea of "theme" as witnessed by the recent trend toward interweaving different pieces of literature that revolve around a central theme. This practice involves dividing multiple pieces of literature to create, essentially, a new whole since no one piece retains its sense of completeness. Interweaving literature flies in the face of traditional oral interpretation practices, not just in the realm of forensics but in the arena of oral interpretation as performance art, as well. As Catherine Zizik writes, "To the performer of oral interpretation, literature matters; performing the literature serves as a vehicle for study" (1).

Ultimately, we must ask ourselves why we engage in oral interpretation as forensics participants. This essay advocates a reworking of the definitions of events to reflect a more pedagogical perspective in directing both coaches and students to the purpose of engaging in oral interpretation. To undertake this study we'll consider how classic oral interpretation texts define oral interpretation. We'll then consider where some of the problems current practices in oral interpretation lead. Next we'll look at the rules of the American Forensics Association as well as the National Forensics Association regarding oral interpretation. Finally, we'll propose new definitions for the oral interpretation events that more closely direct students and coaches to return to the roots of oral interpretation.

Why We Engage in Oral Interpretation

We can turn to classic texts of oral interpretation to come to a greater understanding of the art of oral interpretation. Lee and Gura's Oral Interpretation posits that "Interpretation is the art of communicating to an audience a work of literary art in its intellectual, emotional, and aesthetic entirety" (3). The authors go on to suggest that "your concern is to communicate the total effect of the literary work of art" (5). The emphasis in Lee and Gura's definitions and counsel is clearly on the body of the text. In other words, oral interpretation is about understanding the text.

Lee and Gura are joined in this emphasis on the text by Wallace Bacon and his definition of oral interpretation, "the study of literature through the medium of oral performance where the medium is itself a process of defining" (6). Indeed, Wallace goes on to suggest that "the interpreter must not deny to the body of the poem the right to exist" (38). Wallace, thus, assumes that the literature must retain its autonomy. Though the art of oral interpretation is about performance (Bacon, xvii) the performance is a *means to an end,* understanding the literature.

A more simplified definition is offered by Teri and Michael Gamble, "As an oral interpreter, your responsibility is to make the words of an author live; your task is to breathe energy into each page of a selected script" (3). The idea of making words come alive as an interpreter is common in any discussion of oral interpretation. Yet, it also raises some questions about how free the interpreter is to bring those words to life. The Ethical Use of Literature Policy provided by the American Forensics Association states that "contestants may not rewrite a prose, a poem, or a dramatic text so that the work differs from the original text" (AFA Invitation). Current practices beg the question: what is fair use?

As some of the current practices of competitive oral interpretation illustrate, the emphasis on text has been sacrificed to the idea of theme. Several practices demonstrate this shift in emphasis: the binder used as a prop, the lack of titles in the introduction, and the interweaving of texts. We can explore each of these practices to come to a greater understanding of how the text has been demoted in the practice of competitive oral interpretation to a second player rather than the star attraction.

The rules for oral interpretation by both the American Forensic Association and the National Forensic Association mandate that a manuscript be used. One can surmise that this mandate has its genesis in the idea that the text must be paramount to the performance. Yet current practices render the manuscript as devotee to text virtually useless. The issue of memorizing the script has some relevance though may not be a direct reflection on the lack of emphasis on the text. Performers who must read from the manuscript often lose some ability to bring the literature to life since the audience loses the benefit of facial expression and some vocal variety. However, if anything, the over-reliance on the manuscript at least places some emphasis on the text. On the other hand, those performers who have the script memorized can better use facial expression and vocal variety to bring life to the words. In the end memorizing has more to do with performance style than the central issue of the relevance of text.

The use of the binder as a prop does, however, indicate a growing trend that moves performance away from an emphasis on text. Rules for duo interpretation, though no other event, prohibit the use of props. Yet, increasingly, the binder is used in ways that can be called nothing other than prop. For example, this author has seen binders used as steering wheels, fishing reels, dance partners, and more logical choices such as books. Often in recreating the binder as a prop, the binder is closed to give the illusion of the object. Yet, why have the manuscript if one can't read it? This strategy illustrates the devaluing of the text. Clearly, some uses of the binder as prop are done for the novelty value rather than for any real need to use the manuscript as a prop.

This author would suggest that a good interpreter need not use the binder as a prop since effective vocal and physical imaging would eliminate any need for extraneous props. In addition, the art of oral interpretation relies on the use of both bodily and vocal delivery to convey meaning. Brent C. Oberg contends that one of the differences between acting and interpreting is that in interpretation props are not used. He writes, "Interpreters must use their bodies to suggest at the presence of any objects, scenery, or characters in the performing area" (115). This author remembers Laura Gordon from Clarion State College performing poetry in an elimination round at NFA Nationals. The image of the performer resting her hand on a ballet bar and the presence Ms. Gordon created was indelible. A performer interpreting the same literature in the 1990s might use a closed binder to recreate the bar, an easier yet much less affecting gesture. The point here is that when a forensics performer engages in the art of interpretation, hoping to illuminate the text, will rely less on gimmicks and more on the words and their resonance to create meaning.

Yet, the use of props is a somewhat debatable trend in determining the viability of the text in forensics performance. An even more disturbing and more closely damning practice is the idea of leaving out the titles of pieces when delivering the introduction. Performers will list the genre and the authors, neglecting to illuminate the individual work being addressed. This practice would seemingly assert that the author had but one literary credit to their name, a highly unlikely prospect. With the advent of interwoven literature, performers commonly present a plethora of individual pieces within a ten minute time frame. It is not uncommon to hear ten to twelve different selections within one program. As a matter of convenience, performers will abbreviate the introduction be eliminating the titles of the individual pieces.

By not providing the titles of pieces performers either knowingly or not deny autonomy to the pieces that they perform. In essence what becomes important is the genre and the author. While the subject of author intention is always precariously discussed, the mention of author seems at times misleading since for many programs more than one selection from one author may be used. In this case, an announcement such as "Poetry by Edward Field," would eliminate any understanding that there were two different poems by Mr. Field being performed, say "Curse of the Catwoman" and "Frankenstein." Yet, this author is sure that Mr. Field would consider each of these works as separate, autonomous works in and of themselves. Lumping the poetry together under the phrase "poetry" denies to the author the ability to create a diverse body of work. In addition, this negligence prohibits the audience from making judgements about the efficacy of a program because they are denied full knowledge of what they are hearing.

In addition, the mention of genre seems more than likely to be a delineation of type to satisfy event criteria such as in the case of Program Oral Interpretation which demands the use of two or more different genres. Contemporary poetry as well as the use of monologues as dramatic interp also skew the boundaries of genre for the listener of these types. Accordingly, mentioning the genre is appropriate at times. However, listing the genre rather than the title indicates the superiority of the genre over the actual text, a problem for the student of oral interpretation as art. This practice indicates that the individual piece is no longer important in competitive forensics.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Yet eliminating the title from the introduction is, this author believes, merely a byproduct of the practice of interweaving various texts, the most common method of presenting multiple selections. Knapp elucidates some of the pedagogical and ethical dilemmas of interwoven literature (in press). One of the major dilemmas presented by the use of interwoven literature is the likelihood that an individual piece loses its identity, "Intertwined literature would seem to deny the literature a right to exist if that literature no longer retains its autonomy."

The major dilemma facing an audience viewing the interwoven text is the difficulty in gaining meaning from the individual selection when that text is interrupted by other literature. The theme of the program tells the audience what they should take from each piece. In essence both the performer and listener highlight the theme in the literature, which is not necessarily inappropriate. However, when the literature has more to offer than just what meets the needs of the theme, this literature is sacrificed to the theme.

Since many programs often use several pieces we must also question how much of a selection is represented in a program. In a ten minute program with a thirty second introduction, nine and a half minutes are left to develop several pieces. While certainly many poems can easily fit into this time frame, prose rarely fits into such constraints, thereby requiring a major cutting of the piece. In this case how much of the actual literature can actually be developed to give an essence of the WHOLE of the selection? In these programs part of the literature is performed because of what that part offers to the theme. Yet, the idea that oral interpretation should illuminate the whole of the text is obviously not the goal of this type of interpretation.

Given this cursory examination of the problems associated with the lack of emphasis on the text in contemporary competitive forensics, what can be done to reposition the text as the central subject in oral interpretation? While individual students, coaches, and judges can mount a crusade to resurrect traditional oral interpretation, perhaps the forensics community can aid in this noble crusade by offering prescriptive relief through a redrawing of the rules for oral interpretation events.

The Rules

The invitation to the American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament elucidates the rules for the engagement of oral interpretation:

> Prose Interpretation: A selection or selections of prose material of literary merit, which may be drawn from more than one source. Play cuttings and poetry are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time is 10 minutes including introduction.
>
> Dramatic Duo: A cutting from a play, humorous or serious, involving the portrayal of two or more characters presented by two individuals. This material may be drawn from stage, screen or radio. This is not an acting event; thus, no costumes, props, lighting, etc., are to be used. Presentation is from the manuscript and the focus would be off-stage and not to each other. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.
>
> Program Oral Interpretation: A program of thematically-linked selections of literary merit, chosen from two or three recognized genres of competitive interpretation (prose/poetry/drama) A substantial portion of the total time must be devoted to each of the genres used in the program. Different genre means the material must appear in separate pieces of literature (e.g., a poem included in a short story that appears only in that short story does not constitute a poetry genre). Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction and/or transitions.
>
> Drama Interpretation: A cutting which represents one or more characters from a play or plays of literary merit. This material may be drawn from stage, screen or radio. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.
>
> Poetry Interpretation: A selection or selections of poetry of literary merit, which may be drawn from more than one source. Play cuttings and prose works are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.

Though the National Forensic Association offers fewer interpretation events than the American Forensic Association, the organization offers similar guidelines for the interpretation events that are offered:

> Prose: The contestant will present a program of prose literature. Original introductory comments and transitional remarks are permitted. Programs may consist of single or multiple selections. Plays are not permitted. Manuscripts are required. Maximum 10 minutes.
>
> Poetry: The contestant will present a program of poetic literature. Original introductory comments and transitional remarks are permitted. Programs may consist of single or multiple selections. Manuscripts are required. Maximum 10 minutes.
>
> Dramatic Duo: A cutting from a play, humorous or serious, involving the portrayal of two or more characters presented by two individuals. This is not an acting event. Thus, costumes, props, etc., are not permitted. Presentation must be from manuscript and focus would be off stage. Maximum 10 minutes.

What is notable in both sets of rules is the lack of a purpose for any of the events. In comparison, the public address events are clear in terms of the purpose for engaging in the event. To wit, the NFA rules prescribe that Persuasion is a "speech to convince to move to action or to inspire on a significant issue." Informative Speaking rules from the AFA invitation state, "an original, factual speech by the student on a realistic subject to fulfill the general aim to inform the audience." The NFA rules for After Dinner Speaking are to the point, "[e]ach contestant will present an original speech whose purpose is to make a serious point through the use of humor." Perhaps the most complex event of all is Communication Analysis. Yet, the AFA rules offer a succinct explanation for the purpose of the event: "An original speech by the student designed to offer an explanation and/or evaluation of a communication event such as a speech, speaker, movement, poem, poster, film campaign, etc. through the use of rhetorical principles." Given these rules, both speaker and audience are clear as to what the speaker should attempt to do in each speech type and what the audience should take from the speech.

Since oral interpretation is less obviously titled than many of the public address events, these events require more direction in their description and the rules for their engagement. Consequently, this author proposes the following wording changes (***indicated in bold italics***) for the American Forensic Association National Individual Events Championship rules[1]:

> ***Interpretation of Prose Literature***: A selection or selections of prose material of literary merit ***designed to illuminate an understanding of the text through the use of vocal and physical delivery. Multiple selections may be used when the illuminated texts share a common theme***. Play cuttings and poetry are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.
>
> ***Dual Interpretation of Dramatic Literature***: A cutting from a play, humorous or serious, involving the portrayal of two or more characters presented by two individuals ***for the purpose of illuminating an understanding of the text.*** This material may be drawn from stage, screen, or radio. This is not an acting event; thus, no costumes, props, lighting, etc., are to be used. Presentation is from the manuscript and the focus should be off-stage and not to each other. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.
>
> ***Program Oral Interpretation of Literature: A program of literature from two or three recognized genres of competitive interpretation (prose/poetry/drama) for the purpose of illuminating an understanding of the texts through the use of vocal and physical delivery. Literature should be chosen because the illuminated texts share a common theme.*** A substantial portion of the total time must be devoted to each of the genres used in the program. Different genre means the material must appear in separate pieces of literature (e.g., A poem included in a short story that appears only in that short story. does not constitute a poetry genre). Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction and/or transitions.

---

[1] Since the AFA Tournament offers the most events, these are the specific rules that the author chooses to rewrite as examples. The NFA and other organizations could and should easily follow suit.

Interpretation of Dramatic Literature: A cutting which represents one or more characters from a play or plays of literary merit ***designed to illuminate an understanding of the text through the use of vocal and physical delivery. Multiple selections may be used when illuminated texts share a common theme.*** This material may be drawn from stage, screen or radio. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including original introduction.

Interpretation of Poetic Literature: A selection or selections of poetry of literary merit ***designed to illuminate an understanding of the text through the use of vocal and physical delivery. Multiple selections may be used when illuminated texts share a common theme.*** Play cuttings and prose works are prohibited. Use of manuscript is required. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes including introduction.

These proposed rules do several things. First, the events are renamed to reflect the importance of the literature selection. Second, the rules place the emphasis on the text by offering a purpose for engaging in interpretation of each of the genres. In addition, these proposed rules offer a means to achieving the understanding of the literature. Finally, the proposed rules make the idea of theme subsidiary to the understanding of the text. These proposed changes refocus the direction of oral interpretation to the roots of oral interpretation as art, thus providing a sound pedagogical base for undertaking a program of oral interpretation. A more practical benefit is the parallel these offer to the public address events in terms of offering a goal to be achieved by the performer.

It is necessary to note that these rules do not preclude the possibility of interwoven texts. Rather, these proposed rules offer direction for those new to the events. In addition, the proposed rules offer both coaches and judges guidelines for helping students to engage in a pedagogically sound activity by providing goals for the activity. These goals reflect an understanding of traditional purposes for undertaking oral interpretation of literature such as those explicated by Lee and Gura, and Bacon.

Conclusion

Current practices in competitive oral interpretation reveal an alarming trend where competitors devalue the individual text for the purposes of achieving a thematically linked program. In these cases, the theme takes priority over the autonomy of individual texts. This essay advocates a return to a classical approach to understanding the text through oral interpretation whereby the text ceases to be a means to an end (the theme) but rather becomes the end in and of itself.

By first outlining definitions of oral interpretation and then discussing some of the problems with current practices in competitive oral interpretation, the essay establishes a need for the reworking of rules for competition in interpretation. The proposed rules for the various oral interpretation events offer both direction and method for achieving the illumination of literature. In addition, the proposed rules offer students, coaches, and judges a basis for approaching the interpretation events.

Refocusing the rules to place emphasis on the literature rather than on themes, can return oral interpretation to the roots from which it came. In this way the forensic community can resurrect the emphasis on literature once again.

Works Cited

Bacon, W. A. (1979). The art of interpretation. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gamble, T. and Gamble, M. (1994). Literature alive: The art of oral interpretation. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Goodnow Knapp, T. "Interwoven ethics: The dilemma of literature manipulation." Southern Journal of Forensics. In press.

Lee, C. I. & Gura, T. (1987). Oral interpretation. 7th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Oberg, B. C. (1995). Forensics: The winner's guide to speech contests. Colorado Springs, CO: Meriwether Publishing.

Zizik, C. (1994, November). Establishing a Critical Stance: Making the Poetry Introduction More than Perfunctory Puffery. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

DEVELOPING FUNCTIONAL STANDARDS AS A MEANS TO GREATER ACCESSIBILITY IN NFA-LD

John M. Devine
University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI

A consistent theme of debate league innovation and alternatives has been the attempt at an increased focus on "substantive" argument along with increased accessibility to the activity. The National Forensic Association's Lincoln-Douglas Debate (NFA-LD) is one of the more recent responses to the desire for an event which promotes topic specific argumentation, at a reasonable rate of delivery, which is accessible to students with no formal debate experience. NFA-LD's approach provides a reference point for examining the interaction of the league and event structure in the context of the desire for less speed, more substance, and, more accessibility.

The argument I will pursue is, first, defining a specific paradigm for judging was an excellent first step toward the above mentioned goals. And, second, there is still a need for a league-wide forum to specify and disseminate this paradigm. This development, in the specific situation of NFA-LD as well as debate leagues in general, shifts paradigmatic argumentation to the organizational level, at which it belongs. The pressure to "speed" is reduced. And, finally, accessibility is increased as both debaters and judges are not required to argue procedural, or paradigmatic, theory in rounds. I will trace this progression through three scenarios--a "no-holds-barred" format, the NFA-LD model and a modified version of NFA-LD, incorporating a league-wide forum on procedural/paradigmatic definition. At each step, paradigmatic argumentation is moved further away from individual rounds and closer to league-wide consideration.

The No-Holds-Barred Format

I am defining this form of debate league by its incorporation of the ideal of the tabula rasa judge, or the freedom for the judge to adopt any judging paradigm at the judge's discretion. I believe there is little argument that this demands a thorough knowledge of argumentation and debate theory on the part of competitors and judges. Important for my argument is the fact that this argumentation addresses validity issues revolving about the structure, application, and, implications, of generic forms of arguments. Some examples include judging paradigm arguments (which are valid or appropriate), types of case structure arguments (hypo-testing, parametric cases, whole resolution arguments, etc.), or arguments over appropriate procedure for categories of arguments (whether/how topicality should figure into the judge's decision). In these, and other issues relating to whole categories of argument, the first assumption, or ideal, must be that the participants recognize the differences and implications of various forms, or categories, of argument. Second, we must assume that participants have criteria for selecting among forms of argument.

The first assumption contributes greatly to the speed of rounds, the decreased focus on the resolution at hand, and the lack of accessibility in these types of leagues. To illustrate by the least extreme example, we can take the debater who wants to eschew speed in favor of strategy, and focus on the resolution. To make one strategic response to a whole-resolution argument, the debater must still understand (have the general argumentation experience or theory background) regarding both the possible alternative types of cases, and an understanding of which criteria are available for choosing among those possibilities. These are requisite even to make one response about why the original argument is irrelevant to the round. Even in this minimum situation, much more so in the case of the debater who wishes to cover all the bases at all the levels, speed is increased and accessibility is decreased through the necessity of addressing and selecting among arguments about types of arguments.

The second assumption, the understanding and application of criteria, has a more subtle, but, I believe, more profound effect on both the round and the league. Regarding speed, substance, and accessibility, the lack of a defined reference, or criteria, opens the door to an ever more removed value argument addressing the question of which criteria should be employed. The argument is no longer about a category of argument in particular, but what should we look for in any category of argument. This happens, for example, when the argument turns from whether or not a case represents the whole resolution to whether or not it should be required to represent the whole resolution. Any justification is subject to the claim that the basis of the justification misconstrues what debate should be. At this point a new set of criteria is invoked. In my experience, this path devolves to a debate over what is "best" debate, or what is best for debate as an activity. The regression along the criteria defining what is considered "good" or "best" compounds the necessity for speed and background.

There is another implication of allowing the value debate over what is best for debate to be played out on a round-by-round basis. Placing this debate in rounds, rather than at the league level, subverts any league-wide standards. What can we say about debaters, which win different rounds different tournaments? The basis for comparison is no longer situated with the league, it remains in the round. The league is reduced to some generalizations about debaters having a good arsenal, good strategy, and good coverage, without ever being able to comment on their competing in the arena of the topic. Metaphorically, the league ceases to become the arena of competition in favor of a slew of arenas (rounds), each with their own standards of judgment. This is the functional equivalent of allowing individual referees to decide who wins a basketball game using either score, or stamina, or ball-handling, or rebounds, etc. My argument here, despite the prejudicial nature of the metaphors, is not that this is an unworthy approach. I want to draw attention to the difference between the comparisons (competitions) which leagues claim to legitimate, and the comparisons that are justified by the league structure. This is particularly important in a political climate which stress accessibility, both generally and according to the ideals held by most forensic programs.

In summary, it is tempting to hold a "no-holds-barred" league as the ultimate in freedom for debaters and judges, a "true test" of ability in the face of the widest range of possibilities. It is, however, a particular form of freedom, which restrains the league from advocating ideals as a group. It is a freedom, which shifts, rather than broadens, the possibilities to a clash over what makes the best debate. It is a freedom, which demands argument over what makes good debate rounds, rather than stressing the enactment of group ideals for what makes a good debate round.

The NFA-LD Model

NFA-LD moves away from the "no-holds-barred" model by specifying a judging criteria. Specifically, the rules call for adherence to a stock issue paradigm in which the participants are required to follow a motivation-cause-solution logic to justify a policy change. This logic of justification is delineated by the requirement that the affirmative prove stock issues--proof of harm or need in the current system (motivation), proof that the motivation is inherent to the current policy system (cause), and proof that the proposed change will satisfy the motivation, or yield advantages, by counteracting the cause (solution).

This approach displaces arguments over classes of arguments, which refer to how debate rounds, in general, should be run or decided. The most obvious example is the decision as to which form of case should be considered. In a "no-holds-barred" setting, the choice of which logic is acceptable for justifying a proposed resolution is an open issue. Further, at no point must a debater refer to a specific resolution or case to carry out arguments on this issue. It would suffice to argue, for example, that the motivation-cause-solution logic can downplay an examination of the wider social implications of goals, or values, which underlay the identification of a harm, i.e. we are willing to accept that unemployment is undesirable without further thought, and the case structure promotes this type of assumption. On this basis, we could claim that any case, which follows this structure, is unacceptable for consideration. This argument, in this form, is irrelevant to NFA-LD based on the league rules requiring the case structure.

Having already noted the implication of allowing the generic argument in rounds, I will use the above example to point out how NFA-LD displaces, but does not eliminate the argument. Further, defining acceptable types of arguments decreases the pressure for speed, while increasing accessibility. Finally, the displacement of paradigmatic arguments still rewards a command of theory, without sacrificing accessibility.

I refer to the league-wide decisions on paradigmatic argument, the stock issue paradigm in our example, as displacement in two senses, or two directions. First, the decision as to what generic form makes a good case is displaced to the league, or the league policymakers. Second, the argument that this logic downplays an element important to deciding the round can still be made, but it is displaced to the context of the topic of the resolution. A case, which claims the motivation as a need to reduce unemployment, may be met with the argument that reducing unemployment would not be beneficial. The paradigmatic argument against motivation-cause-solution logic may guide the negative to the "unemployment is not bad" response. However, the volume of argument is substantially reduced from choices about logical forms in general to a single claim specific to case content. Second, the theory grounding of the debaters becomes an advantage, but not a requirement. A debater does not need to be able to recite and apply the generic arguments and philosophy regarding the appropriateness of various forms of cases. These generic arguments involving criteria for which form of case to choose are displaced to a specific impact with reference to a specified issue--has unemployment been proven to be a harm. Thus, while rewarding theory knowledge for its guidance in making specific arguments, the event becomes more accessible by not requiring judges and/or new debaters to be able to verbalize the paradigmatic argument, nor to justify the rules of the event. The reference point of the concrete argument with respect to a defined stock issue reduces the pressure for speed, as it opens the debate to a wider audience.

Including a League-wide Forum on Paradigm and Definition

Though I introduced these three scenarios as a progression, I am not construing these as linear steps. I suggest this third scenario as a move toward "homing in" on the goals of accessible debate leagues--accessible in terms of delivery to an audience at a reasonable rate, and accessible to audiences, judges and students who may not have four years of experience, or be able to articulate the nuances of argumentation theory. In this sense, the progression involves what we decide is worth promoting, and how to carry out this promotion, from the previous scenarios. In this context, I suggest we follow the lead of NFA-LD, while incorporating a forum, outside of rounds, for debating paradigmatic issues.

The pragmatics of this suggestion are fairly straightforward. I envision an opportunity for an ongoing argument over just such issues as what case structure to require, what constitutes a violation of topicality, what proves inherency, etc. Given the availability of e-mail, conference calls, etc., communication shouldn't be a problem. Any league could designate a procedure for topics to consider, time-frames and procedures for getting input, rendering decisions, and implementing rule changes.

The heart of this third scenario lies in the identification of issues, which require league-wide consensus. In a general sense, I cannot identify what these issues are because they depend on the goals of particular leagues. I have taken the goals of accessibility, substantive argument, and speed reduction as the reference points thus far. For this last scenario, I will focus, briefly, on the goal of substantive argument.

The previous scenarios point out the interaction of criteria and judgment in the definition of substance. This is most evident (in the previous discussion) in the way the stock issues paradigm of NFA-LD forces the generic "forms of cases" argument to be re-cast as substantive argument. The difference between the scenarios is not the argumentation theory, the judges, or the debaters, but what criteria are defined and which are left to be selected in the round. This is the decision, which defines the substance of the rounds. Taking away the value component of the argument--the possibility to compare, generically, the motivation-cause-solution logic to other logics, in the context of better or worse--forces the argument to be made in terms of what the affirmative's claims do or do not accomplish in the context of the purpose of the round. So, the goodness or badness of the rules is not questioned. The question becomes *does the argument accomplish the goals by way of the rules*?

If the goal is rounds where the argumentation is expressed in terms of the case or the resolution, then it is the league's responsibility to decide the criteria for proving or disproving a case. In short, the league should make the value decisions about what constitutes proof, forcing rounds to concentrate on whether the substance of the arguments meet those criteria. Asking whether the argument accomplishes the goals by way of the rules, leaves the league to decide what makes good goals and what makes good rules. This leaves the debaters to argue their arguments, not debate theory.

From an argumentation theory standpoint, I believe there is much more to be had from the distinction between argument, which must conform to standards defined by accomplishment, versus standards defined by character, or value. Within the scope of this paper, the scenarios point out a direction for league development which allows the league to promote substantive argumentation at a reasonable rate of delivery which is accessible to those without an expertise in argumentation or debate theory.

Interestingly, rules, which address the issue of speed or theory directly, do little to remove these pressures. One direction for development rests in first identifying the desirable substance of rounds--the function theory seeks, then deciding the criteria for these at the league level. Making evaluation at the league level, such as which case logics are best and/or which legitimate an affirmative position, forces the debate to the substance of the topic. Second, this approach allows for better comparison among rounds--we have a better sense of what debaters had to accomplish. Third, the scenarios presented give some indication of how these decisions can influence the character of rounds in areas such as speed. Finally, a league-wide forum on function-oriented standards allows all participants to learn and apply the specifics of debate theory, without that expertise becoming a device of discouragement and exclusion.

MAINTAINING THE STATUS QUO:
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRESERVING PUBLIC ARGUMENT IN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE

Steven L. Johnson
Co-Director of Forensics
University of Alaska Anchorage, Anchorage, AK

Accompanied by praise and criticism, the growth of parliamentary debate in recent years has been exponential. As Robert Trapp, current President of the National Parliamentary Debate Association points out in his May 28, 1997 letter to the membership of the NPDA, "(f)rom 1994 to 1997, our Championship Tournament has grown from just over fifty teams to almost four times as many. Measured in numerical terms, the NPDA is a healthy infant." Given this growth, a discussion of the future of parliamentary debate seems appropriate.

Regardless of one's perspective of what parliamentary debate is, much has been written about what parliamentary debate should be. In 1992 Epstein discussed the dissatisfaction with various forms of intercollegiate debate, and suggested that "[o]ne proposed alternative to this rift in the debate community is the development of parliamentary debate under the auspices of the American Parliamentary Debate Association (APDA) and the Western States Parliamentary Debate Association (WSPDA)." Johnson continued the discussion in 1994 by expressing concern that parliamentary debate "may take the same path as CEDA, which is taking the same path which NDT took several years ago . . ." by adopting increasingly specialized styles, vocabularies and judging criteria.

These perspectives, and the manifold others expressed both formally and informally, serve to provide direction for parliamentary debate in relation to other alternatives available. While this is certainly a worthwhile undertaking, I propose that we make an effort to define parliamentary debate by what it is, rather than what it is not. To that end, I subscribe to Trapp's conceptualization of parliamentary debate as a forum for "public argument," and will offer practical recommendations that I believe will further this conception.

Public argument, as discussed by Trapp, is defined by its focus on persuasion of an actual audience rather than an exercise in technical inquiry. Trapp writes: "Parliamentary debate at its best is an event that ought to be enjoyable and educational for public audiences seeking information, education, and even entertainment." (1997b). In short, public argument is that type of an argument directed toward a general audience, rather than toward a particular, technically astute audience.

One of the elements of the current form of parliamentary debate that permits a public argument paradigm is a lack of codified practices and procedures that constrain and prescribe the type of argument permitted and required in the event. Because NPDA parliamentary debate is relatively new to the forensic 'scene,' little codified theory particular to parliamentary debate has developed. Furthermore, in rounds, different perspectives and levels of experience on the part of adjudicators still seems to permit a variety of approaches to the event. As in any public forum, the test for "allowable" tactics or strategies in parliamentary debate is still that of rationality: if it makes sense, argue it. This lack of codification should be embraced and nurtured. To do so, however, we must take care to avoid creating an atmosphere in which forgetting this focus is easy.

In continuing his discussion of the future of parliamentary debate, Johnson shares his concern ". . . that we, as professionals, lack the courage to penalize students who fail to communicate or speak only in jargon that people outside the activity cannot understand" (1994). In doing so, he identifies a contributing factor to the increased specialization evident in other forms of debate rather than the primary cause. While we as judges may be afraid to penalize increased specialization and technicality, I believe it is the very structure of modern tournaments that creates an atmosphere in which a move toward increased specialization, a prevalence of highly technical argument, and use of jargon can occur.

Whenever a group sequesters itself, whether intentionally or unintentionally, in pursuit of an objective, a certain amount of specialization naturally occurs: groups develop their own cultures and norms, professions generate their own vocabularies, academic disciplines become more and more technical, and so on. Such a setting provides a fertile environment for the natural evolution of knowledge; because the members of our activity share a context developed and reinforced weekend after weekend, a high degree of specialization is bound to occur. This is the type of environment created by the current sequestered structure of modern debate tournaments. I'm not arguing that such concentration and specialization is without merit; certainly much solid thought has emerged from what we do in our forensic tournament laboratories. My concern lies with the inherent contradiction in the practice of sequestering ourselves at a tournament to compete in an event designed to teach skills necessary to persuade an audience--any audience.

Each new incarnation of debate brings with it a host of new opportunities. I believe the unique opportunity inherent in parliamentary debate is its ability to provide a genuine setting for public debate. When asked what excites me about parliamentary debate, I frequently answer that it allows me the opportunity to bring debate back to the people--to provide the general public with a venue in which they may observe or participate in a dialectic that shapes perceptions of fact, value and policy. As directors of programs featuring parliamentary debate we must make a commitment to 'bringing debate back to the people.' As Trapp argues, "[p]arliamentary-style debates ought . . . to be made available to groups of high school and college students, to clubs and service organizations, as well as to members of the public at large" (1997b).

Involving 'real' audiences has two distinct advantages: first, it preserves the public argument focus of parliamentary debate, and second, it ensures our own longevity. As discussed above, the only way to ensure that our students are learning skills that will transfer readily out of competitive debate and into the real world is to make the venue in which they test those skills as much like the real world as possible. While it is unreasonable to expect that an exact match to actual conditions can be obtained, at the very least we owe it to our students to provide them with an audience much like they will encounter in the 'real world,' be it a courtroom, a boardroom, or a campaign war room. With regard to the second advantage, we can no longer afford the luxury of bemoaning the decrease in support of forensic programs that serve only a minuscule portion of the student body. To be healthy, we must be visible. To be visible, we must offer a product that is accessible to all.

With these goals in mind, I offer two recommendations that can, with a minimum of effort, capitalize on the unique accessibility of parliamentary debate while preserving its public argument focus: 1) we must make a commitment to aggressively market our debate product, and 2) we must create a product that is accessible and desirable for a consumer.

Unfortunately, as we are all too well aware, debate events are not as popular as other activities--such as athletics and theatre--typically sponsored by colleges and universities. Thus, the first recommendation--to aggressively market debate--adheres to a principle very familiar to professional marketers: to sell a product you first have to create a demand.

I have faith that interest in debate on the part of the general public can be generated--if that interest is cultivated properly. Successful creation of a market for parliamentary debate is essential to the health of the activity. We have here a form of debate that is not only accessible to the general public, but integrates within its guidelines elements of popular appeal: humor, wit and heckling are all attributes of a successfully staged debate event that are sure to have an audience demanding more. Emphasizing these attributes, with word of mouth, topic selection, or pre-event publicity can encourage people to attend. Nearly everyone, since the times of the Romans during the Colosseum to the Salem Witch Trials to the World Wrestling Federation, has been able to assemble an audience for what they think will be a no-holds-barred fight. This natural human predisposition to voyeurism can easily be exploited by emphasizing the "argument" part of debate. What's more fun than a good fight? This, of course, does not mean that substantive inquiry is necessarily sacrificed for screaming and hair-pulling. Some of the best debates of our times have been an eloquent balance of crowd pleasing wit coupled with insightful analysis. In other words, once you get them there with the flash, you'll hold them there with the substance.

Further, we need to do more to educate our market about the product we want them to consume. When contrasting American styles of debate with British styles, the first thing one notices is how much more raucous the British house seems. American audiences tend to be quite reserved when attending an 'event.' If we encourage them to become involved--either informally through heckling or formally through opportunities such as floor speeches--we make the event less of a formal "lecture" and more of an enjoyable participatory event.

Finally, we need to be more diligent in seeking sponsorship for our events. Local politicians, newspapers, libraries, literary societies, bookstores, radio and TV stations, and so on are prime targets for support. Additionally, there's no reason that the Championship Tournament, with proper publicity, can't develop strong relationships with sponsors. The Irish Debate Series is sponsored by *The Irish Times*, why not ask one of our national newspapers to respond in kind? An official paper for the Championship Tournament? National coverage for a national event? It seems only intuitive.

But to properly market a product, we must have a product to market. Unfortunately, while an efficient means of creating a great deal of exposure to a variety of competitors in a very short period of time, the average forensic tournament is not conducive to hosting observers. Too many times I've seen bewildered parents, teachers, or community members interested in debate wandering aimlessly around a tournament while those that understand the secret code of postings scurry to their rounds. Frankly, your average member of the public seems to have little interest in committing their entire weekend to plodding around an unfamiliar campus. Instead, I propose two under-utilized alternate venues that may attract new consumers to the product of debate: intramural tournaments and contract debates.

An intramural tournament, hosted for students at a particular campus, can have great appeal. It can be either a short effort, over the course of a week or weekend, or it may be scheduled to take place over an entire semester. Such tournaments offer the opportunity for different departments to sponsor teams, or may be open to all members of the student body. Often, sponsorship may be gained from local businesses for awards: airline tickets, merchandise, restaurant gift certificates, and the like not only provide incentive for students to get involved, but offer a cheap form of advertisement to what traditionally is a significant portion of a local business's market. Students involved in the forensic program or faculty from various departments may serve as adjudicators for the tournament. An informative session on the procedures of parliamentary debate--which may of course be modified for convenience--and a single-elimination format make for relatively simple administration. In addition to being an exceptional recruiting tool for the competitive forensic program, such a tournament exposes the entire student body to debate, and ensures that later debate events will have a market to which the events may be "sold."

Contract debates are not a new idea. In fact, the designation "contract debates" comes from the earliest form of intercollegiate debating. A university's debating club would invite a local rival to campus to debate in front of an audience of local supporters and, hopefully, boosters from the visitors' university. The topic would be announced in advance so both teams have time to prepare adequately, and impartial guest judges and/or the audience would adjudicate the event. In its modern conception, a series of contract debates could be scheduled in much the same way that football or basketball games are scheduled, with several occurring over the course of a semester. Inviting regional schools increases the 'local rival' aspect of the debate, and inviting a school from further away may emphasize the importance of the event. The advantage of contract debates is that it creates a more consumer-friendly product: the debate is billed as a clash of local rivals, school pride is on the line, and the presence of an audience ensures a lively house.

It is with the recognition that the average director is already pressed for time with teaching, research, service, and coaching that I offer these suggestions. To me, these seem relatively low-effort, high-reward events that can be run with assistance from the student team members. Additionally, I'm not advocating a departure from the current conception of forensic tournaments. Such events are valuable for coaches and students alike and necessary for the growth of the event.

Simply put, we have in parliamentary debate an opportunity to elevate debate once again to a place of prominence. We also have the opportunity to preserve a unique aspect of an event that gives students an education in dialectic that closely parallels its real-world application. Given the potential benefits these suggestions provide, I believe the time is right for us to capitalize on those opportunities.

References

Epstein, S. (1992). What parliamentary debate can offer small programs: An observation. Parliamentary Debate: The Journal of the Western States Parliamentary Debate Association, 1, 51-60.

Johnson, J.A. (1994). A veteran director of forensics looks at the future of parliamentary debate. Parliamentary Debate: The Journal of the National Parliamentary Debate Association, 3, 1-4.

Trapp, R. (1997a). National Parliamentary Debate Association fall newsletter.

Trapp, R. (1997b). Parliamentary debate. NPDA Homepage. URL: http://www.willamette.edu/cla/rhetoric/debate/chapter.html

Abstract: There are important benefits to integrating non-forensics faculty into assisting with the instruction and training of intercollegiate parliamentary debaters. These benefits may also spill over into individual events in a limited way. Parliamentary debate, if done well, requires that debaters have a broad based education covering many diverse disciplines, especially philosophy, history and political science, and of course a familiarity with current national and international events. Enlisting the aid of non-forensics professors from various departments to provide occasional mini-lectures on diverse topics can help improve this broad-based education. Additionally, there are other unique benefits to encouraging non-forensics faculty members to share ownership of this interdisciplinary academic activity. The model proposed and discussed is the Forensics Fellows program being implemented at Point Loma Nazarene Colleg. in San Diego, California.

FORENSICS FELLOWS:
INTEGRATING FACULTY PARTICIPATION INTO INTERCOLLEGIATE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE PROGRAMS

Lewis E. Rutledge
Director of Forensics
Point Loma Nazarene College, San Diego, CA

Overview

Parliamentary debate is probably the fastest growing activity in intercollegiate forensics over the past few years. It is a popular alternative to other forms of intercollegiate debate for many reasons. One of its primary appeals is its public or audience centered focus, designed to appeal to most any audience, regardless of their debate background or subject matter expertise. This form of public debate focuses more on the substance of the issues debated and less on the meta-debate elements such as format, rules, debate theory and/or jargon.

More traditional homes of intercollegiate debate have evolved, at least at their more experienced levels of participation, into more specialized forms of communication that require a greater awareness of the technical aspects of advanced debate theory and specific knowledge of the jargon and theoretical constructs of both debate in general and the specific topic area being debated. CEDA and NDT debate currently debate the same resolution all year. This prolonged period of analysis of one topic allows and encourages a much deeper and more comprehensive research effort over a specific field of study. Without such specific knowledge it can be very difficult to follow the more competitive of these debates as an audience member, participant, critic, or coach. Further complicating the task of following these forms of debate for untrained listeners is the extremely rapid rate of delivery that is common in the more experienced levels of CEDA or NDT debate. Many novices find it too difficult to overcome these entry barriers within the more traditional forms of debate that focus on one or two topics the whole year.

Many believe there are less severe entry barriers to successful participation in parliamentary debate, which emphasizes eloquence over speed, and generalized argumentation over specific knowledge based arguments, and a universal audience focus over relying upon the technical expertise of the listeners. Additionally, by not designating one central resolution for the entire season in parliamentary debate there is less pressure on debaters to spend extensive hours in the library becoming a subject matter expert on the designated topic. The above points are not an attempt to argue for the superiority of one form over another, merely to evaluate the apparent appeal of parliamentary debate over the more traditional forms of intercollegiate debate. In short, parliamentary debate seems to provide an environment where participants can compete on a more level playing field despite inherent differences in program's size, resources, experience of coach, experience of students, etc.

The Problems

Having suggested various reasons why parliamentary debate may have fewer entry barriers for programs and individual debaters alike, it is important to clarify that there are still some significant problems associated with starting or running a parliamentary debate program. These problems can be subdivided into difficulties specifically relating to parliamentary debate, and larger issues common to directing most intercollegiate forensics programs.

First, to effectively train successful parliamentary debate teams seemingly requires a broad base of knowledge over a tremendous breadth of topic areas, primarily current events, philosophy and political science, but also drawing heavily from history, economics, psychology and other disciplines as well. This requirement may intimidate some away from actively participating in this activity, at both the student and coach level. At least with knowing that there is one main topic area (as in CEDA or NDT debate), there is a chance to prepare on many, if not most, of the main debatable areas for the year. It can be very intimidating to know that in any given parliamentary tournament you will be debating, or judging, from six to 10 or more completely different topic areas, with just 15 minutes to gather your thoughts after hearing the motion, before delivering the first speech.

One strategy may be to just recruit bright, well-educated and informed students that have already obtained encyclopedic knowledge of all matters of potential importance, and teach them to debate. While such students should never be turned away, it would be horribly limiting to only cater to these rare students, when debate can be such a wonderful mind expanding tool for so many others as well. Another alternative is to simply teach debate skills and recommend that students become well read, knowing what a hit or miss proposition this might be for developing an awareness on any given subject. The probable result of such an approach would be many uninformed debaters trying to build opposing arguments from collective ignorance and calling it a debate. This too would be inadvisable. Uninformed debate can be worse than no debate at all. It simply compounds ignorance. This type of debate is probably the reason many have not embraced parliamentary debate thus far. While it is a difficult problem to overcome, there are other possibilities. One is to recruit a diverse pool of debaters from many different majors and have them share their expertise with others through discussions, mini-lessons, prepared briefs, etc. This is helpful, but it should be supplemented by inviting your colleagues that teach in other departments to share their collective wisdom as well. That is what the Forensics Fellows program attempts to do. This will be developed in greater detail later.

The Forensics Fellows may also help a few other problems that traditionally plague forensics programs and directors. For example, forensics programs may have grown too isolated from the rest of the campus communities. Trying to balance extremely hectic travel, administrative and practice schedules with normal teaching loads often limit forensics directors interaction in the more traditional avenues of faculty interaction, such as faculty meetings, committees, retreats, conferences, etc. Forensics' extensive extracurricular responsibilities can also erode professors' opportunities to conduct academic research and publish their findings, thus reducing their opportunities for academic advancement within some institutions. These extremely long hours combined with a lack of institutional recognition and advancement can contribute to rapid burnout, which costs our colleges some of our most talented forensics educators.

The isolated nature of the forensics programs can conceivably contribute to tensions with other faculty members in various ways. For example, if all another faculty member knows about forensics is that several of the debaters keep missing tests or activities scheduled on Fridays, a certain level of resentment may occur. It may appear as if these students are being allowed to miss important academic assignments just to travel to other schools. Likewise, some faculty members that coach forensics may have to miss committee meetings or department meetings due to tournament conflicts, or have reduced office hours during the week, which may not seem fair to colleagues unfamiliar with the long hours spent on forensics over the weekends. The ever-present budget conflicts may also create resentment from some faculty members that may not realize how expensive it is to run a competitive forensics program. Even if none of the other problems occur, there is significantly less opportunity for forensics faculty members to network with other faculty members due to the long hours required by forensics. All of these areas of resentment, or missed networking opportunities, can ultimately impact the advancement opportunities of the faculty member and/or the administrative support for the program as a whole.

The Proposed Solution

At the risk of making claims that sound like they are better suited for an infomercial, the Forensics Fellows, or similar approaches, can help to solve many of the previously cited problems. Forensics Fellows is a program designed to integrate faculty assistance with intercollegiate forensics programs, primarily in parliamentary debate but potentially also in individual events. Through inviting faculty members that may have had no former association with forensics to commit to one mini-lecture a semester, or year, with the speech and debate team, the problem of expertise is spread out to many other subject matter experts. For example economics professors could discuss pros and cons of free market capitalism, or communism. Political scientists could cover third party politics, or campaign finance reform, or term limits. International relations professors could discuss China's most favored nation status, the United States' role in the United Nations, or the future of the European Common Market. Such contributions should help to combat the collective ignorance issue stemming from the lack of one central, well-researched, year-long topic.

This enhanced interaction between the faculty and the speech and debate team will also offer an increased awareness to the Forensics Fellows of the academic excellence associated with the activity. They will soon realize that rather than merely attempting to miss academic work, our students are really engaging in an intensive form of higher learning with some of the sharpest minds from the best colleges throughout the country. Through encouraging this broader sense of ownership over the school's forensics program, speech and debate can receive the best possible form of public relations. Once others see the amount of work that is invested in debate and the benefits to the students, they should become allies for a quality forensics program. A supportive faculty can help solidify a forensics program by recruiting quality students out of their classes, working closely with the team members on missed assignments, and in various other ways such as through supporting faculty endorsements on budget and/or scholarship committees, etc.

Additionally, with a greater awareness of the amount of time and effort it takes to direct a quality program there should be greater support for the faculty members involved. This support could effect promotion and tenure decisions, class release time, and facility allocation or additional staffing questions. Faculty members that show a greater interest in the activity may even be invited to attend an occasional tournament to see first hand the long hours and the contagious excitement for learning that are now part of the tournament experience. Forensics Fellows may even provide a good lay judging pool of bright, educated, neutral critics that could be very helpful when hosting a parliamentary debate tournament. They can be trained how to be an effective critic by listening to squad debates throughout the year.

Method

Attached to this paper is an informational handout prepared for the Point Loma Nazarene College (PLNC) pilot program entitled "Forensics Fellows: A Cooperative Effort Between the PLNC Faculty and Forensics." The handout contains some important information for non-forensics faculty including an explanation of the purpose or vision of the program, a section briefly explaining the fundamentals of parliamentary debate, a discussion of some topics commonly debated and how students prepare, and a section on how specifically the faculty can help. Also included in the package is a set of rules for the most recent NPDA Championship Tournament, and several sets of sample resolutions. Finally, there is a questionnaire asking for basic contact information from those interested and a series of questions designed to solicit what areas the fellows would like to teach. The questionnaire also has room for suggestions regarding other ideas for speech topics or favorite works of literature to interpret, designed to aid coaching individual events.

Invitations can be extended to one or two of the forensics fellows to prepare a presentation once a week or once every several weeks on a pre-selected topic of general interest. It may help to review the content of the presentation prior to the session. The presentation will take place at the regularly scheduled meeting time for the debate team. Eventually, you may consider inviting members of debate classes to these sessions as well. Students should be encouraged to arrive early and practice active listening skills. Strong note taking skills should also be encouraged, concentrating on noting not only the bigger underlying concepts, but also the major proponents, chief opponents, important dates, supporting or contradicting current or historical events, etc. The presentation can vary based on the needs of the specific program.

One model might have the guest lecturer speaking for 30-40 minutes covering both sides of a controversial issue. While handouts are not necessary, the attached informational package contains a sample brief format that suggests one possible way of outlining the information. Tips for further reading, such as breakthrough or seminal works for each side would be helpful. Or, you may want to invite one guest lecturer to share the pro arguments on a particular issue and another to posit the con arguments. Regardless of the model employed, questions and/or interaction should be encouraged, but care should be taken to arrive at a style of interaction comfortable to the guest speaker. A round table discussion of the central issues and ramifications and potential approaches to take in a debate can be a valuable follow up to the presentation. Following the discussion, time permitting, it might even be a good idea to have a debate or break into groups for multiple debates on the issue discussed. The guest lecturer can either stay and critique the debate, or if time does not allow may be excused prior to the debate. You may wish to assign a given debater to brief one or two sides of the presentation to provide some central record that the entire team could refer to in future weeks or months.

Several items should be noted here. First, be very careful not to try to overwork a particular Forensic Fellow. Try to evenly spread out the speaking assignments even if one's areas are more often discussed in tournaments. You do not want to risk burning out your colleagues. You also don't want to ignore or shun the assistance of others that may have volunteered. Second, be sure to coach your students how to react positively to the guest lecturers. They should be polite, encouraging and affirming. Let the students know that not all professors are comfortable with being challenged on everything they say. Also alert the lecturers that they may expect from the debaters some more direct involvement and interaction with the ideas than they might normally encounter in class. Reassure the guest that this is a positive sign of the students engaging with the ideas, not a sign of disrespect. Remind them that good debaters want to know both sides of an issue and may play devil's advocate to explore or experiment with various ideas, which they may or may not personally favor. Finally, it is also important to be clear on time expectations and to try to honor those times. Finally, a follow up thank you card or small inexpensive gift item might not be a bad idea. While you may be used to volunteering long hours above class requirements for this activity, your colleagues may not be. Let them know how appreciated their time is. One possibility is hosting a thank you lunch or dinner each semester or year where the guest lecturers, or Forensics Fellows, are invited along with the team members.

Discussion of Benefits

This program was just initiated at PLNC late last year following the end of the competitive season, with the intention of implementing it this upcoming year. The program was advertised on the campus E Mail listserv. Following a very positive response rate, about 20% of the faculty committed to help this program, an informational lunch was provided. Forensics Fellows and speech team members both were invited and had a chance to interact over lunch. Following the meal the informational package was discussed. The feedback was very positive from faculty and students alike. The completed questionnaires showed a wide diversity of interest areas. The group was mostly self-selected. Due to the large number of political science and history related topics encountered, a special effort was made to see that all members of the History and Political Science Department were aware of the program. It also helped that a number of the students on the team were history or political science majors, and are often the top students in their classes. Approximately 80% of the history and political science professors volunteered. The student team members may be the best recruiters of their favorite professors on campus.

It is too early to discuss the relative success or failure of this particular program so far. It is hoped that by presenting the idea in this forum others might experiment with some variation of this proposal and in the coming years results can be assessed and compared. The response on our campus even at this early stage has been very positive. Even administrators such as the Vice President of Student Development and the Registrar have volunteered. The potential rewards to the activity as a whole are large. Some of those benefits include but are not limited to:

1. Better understanding by debaters of many diverse topic areas taught by experts in their respective fields.

2. Stronger arguments and better debates due to this increased knowledge base.

3. Stronger interaction between students and professors, benefiting both students and professors.
4. Improved faculty awareness of forensics' high academic merit.
5. A wider debate recruitment net for the top students in each department.
6. Better faculty cooperation when debaters must miss an occasional class.
7. Greater faculty and administrative awareness of effort required to direct forensics.
8. Increased support for forensics faculty in advancement, tenure, release time, etc.
9. Creation of a potential judging pool for hosting parliamentary debates on campus.
10. A positive environment for supporting forensics with adequate budgetary and/or scholarship support.
11. Better integration of forensics with other campus faculty and activities.
12. Less burnout of forensics directors due to increased job satisfaction.
13. Fewer forensics programs being lost due to burn out and loss of directors.
14. Non-debate critics provide a nice check against debaters abusing argumentation theory or jargon without adequate explanation or support.
15. Individual events programs can gain strong recommendations for topics for platform speeches, and/or good suggestions for great literature to interpret mat may not be well known in forensics circles.

The potential harms from such a program mostly center around the potential of poor management techniques in implementing the proposal. It is important to carefully plan out each step. Be sure to solicit adequate feedback from lecturers and students alike and be ready to make changes if necessary.

Conclusion

The Forensics Fellows program is only one of many different possible ways to help integrate non-forensics faculty into assisting with the forensics team. There are obviously many others. You may wish to begin with a much smaller scale effort and reach out to just one or two other professors that may be interested. One of the benefits of the larger scale approach is that your colleagues may see themselves as just one of many volunteering to help. Many hands make light work. Or, they might fear that if they are being contacted individually that you might expect them to do significantly more.

On the other hand, some schools may find that this program provides a natural springboard to an even larger campus or community wide forum for public debates on matters of interest to the public at large. Not only would these events advance public debate and educate your students, they hold the potential for providing a unique fund-raising possibility for your forensics team. There are programs that find they can raise several thousand dollars a year through hosting public debates on issues of community interest, then charging a nominal entry fee and/or selling advertising for programs.

The real goal is to encourage directors of forensics to bridge the gulf and invite colleagues to share in the excitement of teaching through this unique tool. If handled well, everyone should benefit. Your colleagues get to share material that is important to them with bright, inquisitive students that are clearly going beyond classroom expectations. The students gain from the wealth of knowledge that they might not normally be able to access. You are able to bring other perspectives into training sessions, which is very important in critical thinking exercises. The program as a whole also benefits from sharing the ownership with the rest of the faculty. Parliamentary debate is a unique activity that embodies many of the best aspects of a college, empowering bright, articulate students engaging in the critical inquiry of interdisciplinary issues. It is time that we allow others to share in this excitement.

Appendix A – Sample Forensics Fellows Packet

Forensics Fellows:

A cooperative effort between the PLNC Faculty and Forensics

In support of Parliamentary Debate and Individual Events Speaking

1997-98 PLNC FORENSICS FELLOWS AN OVERVIEW:

Thank you for your interest in assisting with the PLNC Parliamentary Debate team by becoming involved in the Forensics Fellows. The purpose of this organization is to allow the student members of the Point Loma intercollegiate debate team to interact with faculty and staff from various departments and benefit from your years of study and expertise in various topics that may lend themselves to future debates. This will primarily benefit the students of course, but it is hoped that you too will benefit from interacting with some of our students outside the confines of the classroom. These speech team members are some of our best and brightest students representing all majors and they regularly commit many hours to compete for the school and to improve their public speaking and critical thinking skills. Many will be headed to various graduate programs when they leave us. Your investment of a few hours in their lives may provide them not only with meaningful subject matter content for future debate rounds, but more importantly with a role model of a caring faculty member. They can see your enthusiasm for your area of interest and catch the excitement of continuing their education beyond just a B.A. or a B.S.

WHAT IS PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE?

Parliamentary Debate is a new and exciting form of intercollegiate debate that stresses both critical thinking and public speaking skills. This audience-centered form of debate rewards well-read, well-spoken competitors that can think quickly on their feet. There are two person teams that represent either the Government or the Opposition in any given round, roughly based on the British Parliament. The contestants only learn of the topic to be debated 15 minutes before the first speech. There is no preparation time between speeches either. As one speaker sits down, the next rises and contests the earlier speaker's arguments.

This particular debate format is intended to be highly interactive. The speakers may engage one another in direct questioning throughout the Constructive speeches (except for during the first and last minute when arguments are being set up or summarized). The judge, or the Speaker of the House, may also be drawn into rule on points of order. For example, if a speaker lodges a new argument in a rebuttal speech, which is against the rules, the opposing team may object to the judge which will be asked to rule immediately. Finally, the audience, or "Members of Parliament," are encouraged to interact through applause at points of agreement. Mild heckling is even encouraged, such as someone saying "shame" quietly if a speaker says something particularly objectionable, such a sexist, bigoted or hurtful remark.

The mechanics are fairly simple. Each speaker has one Constructive speech wherein arguments are posited that support one's own side and/or attacks the opponent's side. Each team has one Rebuttal speech to summarize the key voting issues and reasons why they feel the critic should support their particular side. The order and times of speeches are listed below:

Prime Minister's Constructive	7 minutes
Leader of the Opposition's Constructive	8 minutes
Member of the Government's Constructive	8 minutes
Member of the Opposition's Constructive	8 minutes
Leader of the Opposition's Rebuttal	4 minutes
Prime Minister's Rebuttal	5 minutes

WHAT TOPICS ARE DEBATED?

There is a vast array of potential topics to be debated. They vary from tournament to tournament. Each round has a separate resolution, which is usually completely unrelated to other round's resolutions. There are, however, some guiding principles. Tournament hosts are encouraged to prepare resolutions that focus on controversial, debatable issues regarding current events, politics, or philosophy. Typically students rely on well-known current or historical situations as beginning points for their arguments.

A list of just some of the many potential topics is attached to the back of this paper. For example, one resolution may be "This House Believes That: Violent action to overthrow oppression is legitimate." The Government may choose to focus on one or more examples to illustrate the legitimacy of such a course from various perspectives. They may choose to cite America's revolution from Great Britain to support revolution from bad governments, instead they may wish to isolate the Government's right to take stringent, violent action to liberate its citizen's--such as the Peruvian forces just accomplished against the rebel siege in Peru, or Israel's raid on Entebbe. Hopefully, the Opposition will not only be able to address the specifics of the Government's case and argue the merits suggested therein, they should also be able to bring up similar counter examples to show why and when violence was either not needed or used, and/or where it misfired. In response to the American Revolution, the Opposition might point out that Canada and Australia more peacefully accomplished liberation from Britain and their cultures seem to be far less plagued by rampant violence today perhaps as a result. Likewise, for every successful Peruvian release or Israeli counter terrorist raid, you must look to the more predictable Waco tragedy and/or continuing cycle of violent backlash in the Middle East. And with your help most of our students will also be able to intelligently discuss social contract theory.

HOW CAN OUR STUDENTS PREPARE FOR THIS WIDE A VARIETY OF TOPICS?

They are encouraged to be well-read in current events by keeping up with at least one daily newspaper and one of the news magazines each week for issues. We also subscribe to magazines with an international focus such as *The Economist*, or *The World Press Review*. Additionally, they are encouraged to read as much as possible in Philosophy, History, and Political Science, and to enroll in these courses whenever possible either as a part of their major or for their electives. But even with this, there is no way that they can possibly cover everything in sufficient depth. That is where you come in.

HOW CAN THE PLNC FACULTY HELP?

By allowing our students to glean from areas that you are already well versed in they can greatly expand their knowledge base. These areas of interest need not be limited to just what you teach. Many of you keep abreast of many areas of study that would greatly help our students prepare a broad background of familiarity with important topics or potential illustrations. In short, we are seeking to broaden and deepen these students' education.

Aside from just the debate implications, certain students may want to explore particular topics in greater depth. We also compete in Individual Events, a competitive category which includes student prepared platform speeches, such as Informative or Persuasive speeches, that last from 8 to 10 minutes and are based on much deeper research and study. Additionally, many of the events are of an interpretive nature. They ask the students to interpret good literature, again using cuttings of 8 to 10 minutes in length. Most of our students have not encountered nearly as much great literature as you have. If you can recall some very powerful drama, or poetry, or prose that you found compelling, chances are it could lend itself to a strong performance piece.

HMMM? BUT HOW MUCH TIME WILL THIS TAKE?

We know and appreciate how busy you are and don't want to add to the many other commitments you already have. It would be a great help if we could just know that you would be available or try to make yourself available once or twice a semester or year to meet with the team for perhaps an hour to discuss a topic or topics with which you are already familiar. There may also be an occasional informational lunch or group meeting with the Forensics Fellows as a whole. But that would be optional and more to give us a chance to say thank you for your support and let the students interact with you in a less formal setting. Sometimes these opportunities to interact casually with students over a meal mean more to them than anything else. Those are some of the times I remember most fondly from my undergraduate days.

Realistically we are suggesting that each person plan on the equivalent of one lecture per semester, of approximately 40 minutes to be followed by a round table type exchange of ideas and strategies. It may take a few hours more or less to prepare your notes for this session. Chances are it would not take too long though.

WHAT SPECIFICALLY ARE YOU LOOKING FOR?

The particular format is very much open to suggestion. This project is brand new and I know of no current model to follow, which frees us up considerably. However, what I am envisioning is about an hour with the students learning what you would like to share with them. This would ideally be a blend of lecture and discussion.

You and I could meet earlier and discuss an appropriate topic scope and some sample resolutions that we may expect to encounter at tournaments. What is particularly helpful is if we can see competing interests covered in a particular session. For example, if we could have a speaker cover both the pros and cons of Capitalism, or Democracy, or Communism, or the Insanity Plea in one setting that would be great. Another idea might be to invite several professors at the same time to discuss similar areas and generate some real dialectical discussion. Some form of handouts would be very helpful as well. I've attached a few examples of various briefs the students prepared for last year.[1] As you can see, we have not yet arrived at any particular format and are open to suggestions. A short reading list of some of the major works or most influential thinkers in any given area would also be very helpful.

WHAT CAN I DO NOW TO HELP OUT?

To help organize this project I need to know topic areas in which you are most interested. Knowing your scheduling constraints will also help. The attached questionnaire will help provide some basic informational data and allows you to identify areas of interest or expertise. Please be as general or specific as you wish. I will try to organize a series of sessions (probably only two a month to begin with) to address commonly encountered topic areas. Based on your responses and your availability, we will prepare a schedule of lecture sessions. Due to the number of professors interested, we will try to plan for the entire year without overtaxing anyone. It may be that we ask you if you can share what you know in an area other than what you listed, because it seems as if it might be related to your interest area. Please feel free to bow out of such a request if it is not convenient, interesting to you, or time effective. We would also like your permission to circulate the list of Forensics Fellows to our students who might pick your brains with regard to other speech ideas.

---

[1] Editor's Note: Student briefs have been omitted at the author's request. Persons implementing this program could include materials prepared by their students.

Thanks so much for your help and support.

Appendix B - NPDA Rules

1997 NPDA Championship Tournament Rules

The purpose of these rules is to define goals and procedures of the debates so that, to the extent possible, everyone will enter the debates with a shared set of expectations. These rules are designed to apply to the goals and procedures of debate rather than the substance. They are framed in ways that attempt to allow many degrees of freedom in regard to debaters creativity. These rules are essentially the ones that will be used at the Championship Tournament but may be slightly revised. In any revisions are made, competitors will have final draft of the rules one month prior to the tournament.

RULES OF ELIGIBILITY

1. Debater Eligibility.

Eligibility to participate in the NPDA championship tournament is governed by the by-laws of the NPDA.

2. Judge Eligibility

2A. Each judge will have completed his or her bachelor's degree or will be an intelligent and well-read lay person hired by the tournament director.

2B. No one will be assigned to judge any team if he or she has had any official association with the team's school or with either member of the team during the previous four years. No one will be assigned to judge any person he or she has coached in the past.

2C. Each team will have the opportunity to strike a limited number of judges. The specific number of strikes (between five and ten) will be determined by the tournament director based on the size of the judging pool.

2D. At any time after the first round of competition, any team may present cause to the tournament committee why they should not be heard by a particular judge. Such petitions will be accepted only in very serious cases including, but not limited to, verbal, physical, or sexual assaults or threats, occurring during the NPDA tournament.

2E. All judges should be available for assignment through the octafinals. Judges whose teams do not qualify for the octafinals may, if they wish, be excused after octafinals. All other judges must be available through the final round.

3. Sanctions

In the case of serious violations of these Rules, debaters or judges may be withdrawn from the tournament by a 2/3 vote of the Tournament Committee.

RULES OF DEBATING AND JUDGING

1. Resolutions

1A. A different resolution for each round will be presented to the debaters fifteen minutes prior to the beginning of each debate.

1B. The topic of each round will be about current affairs or philosophy. The resolutions will be general enough that a well-educated college student can debate them. They may be phrased in literal or metaphorical language.

2. Objective of the debate

The government team must affirm, and the opposition must oppose the resolution. The government must make and defend a sufficient case for the resolution. If, at the end of the debate, the judge believes that the government has successfully defended the resolution, they will be declared the winner; otherwise the opposition will be declared the winner.

3. Before the debate

The government team, if they wish, may use the room assigned for debate for their preparation. If the government team uses the debating room for preparation, both the judge and the opposition must vacate the room until the time for the debate to begin.

4. During the debate

4A. Except for notes made during preparation time, no prepared materials or resources for the debater's use in the round may be brought into the debating chambers.

4B. Debaters may refer to any information which is within the realm of knowledge of liberally educated and informed citizens. If they believe some cited information to be too specific, debaters may request that their opponent explain specific information with which they are unfamiliar.

4C. Format of the debate

Prime Minister Constructive	7 minutes
Leader of Opposition Constructive	8 minutes
Member of Government Constructive	8 minutes
Member of Opposition Constructive	8 minutes
Leader of Opposition Rebuttal	4 minutes
Prime Minister Rebuttal	5 minutes

4D. Constructive and Rebuttal Speeches

Introduction of new arguments is appropriate during all constructive speeches. However, debaters may not introduce new arguments in rebuttal speeches except that the Prime Minister may introduce new arguments in his or her rebuttal to refute arguments that were first raised in the Member of Opposition Constructive. New examples, analysis, analogies, etc. which support previously introduced arguments are permitted in rebuttal speeches.

4E. Points of Information

A debater may request a point of information--either verbally or by rising--at any time after the first minute and before the last minute of any constructive speech. The debater holding the floor has the discretion to accept or refuse points of information. If accepted, the debater requesting the point of information has a maximum of fifteen seconds to make a statement or ask a question. The speaking time of the debater with the floor continues during the point of information.

4F. Points of Order

If at anytime during the debate, a debater believes that his or her opponent has violated one of these Rules of Debating and Judging, he or she may address the Speaker of the House with a point of order. Once recognized by the Speaker of the House, the debater must state, but may not argue for, the point of order. At the discretion of the Speaker of the House, the accused may briefly respond to the point of order. The Speaker of the House will then rule immediately on the point of order in one of three ways: point well taken, point not well taken, or point taken under consideration. The time used to state and address a point of order will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor.

A point of order is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor violations. Debaters may be penalized for raising spurious points of order.

4G. Points of Personal Privilege

At any time during the debate, a debater may rise to a point of personal privilege when he or she believes that an opponent has personally insulted one of the debaters, has made an offensive or tasteless comment, or has grievously misconstrued another's words or arguments. The Speaker will then rule on whether or not the comments were acceptable. The time used to state and address a point of personal privilege will not be deducted from the speaking time of the debater with the floor.

Like a point of order, a point of personal privilege is a serious charge and should not be raised for minor transgressions. Debaters may be penalized for raising spurious points of personal privilege.

5. After the debate

5A. After the Prime Minister Rebuttal, the Speaker of the House will dismiss the teams, complete the ballot and return it to the tournament director. The judges should not give oral comments before the ballot is completed and returned to the tournament director.

5B. After returning the ballot, the judge may, at his or her discretion, give brief constructive comments to the debaters. Judges should refrain from announcing the decision. After these comments, debaters and coaches will refrain from seeking further information about the debate from the judge.

5C. Debaters or coaches will refrain from requesting that judges reveal decisions. Debaters or coaches who harass judges for information may be withdrawn from the tournament on a two-thirds vote of the Tournament Committee.

Appendix C - Sample Topics

Parliamentary Debate Resolutions
The Sunset Cliffs Classic Invitational
Point Loma Nazarene College
January 31-February 2, 1997

Round 1: This House Believes (THB) that justice is blind.
Round 2: THB that television corrupts the mind.
Round 3: THB that America neglects her young.
Round 4: THB that it is better to give than to receive.
Round 5: THB that dogs make better pets than do cats.
Round 6: THB that embracing Ebonics is a recipe for failure.
Octafinals: THB that gender equality is a myth.
Quarterfinals: THB that the ends do not justify the means.
Semifinals: TH would support the impeachment of Boris Yeltsin.
Finals: THB that the inmates are running the asylum.

Parliamentary Debate Resolutions
The Pacific Southwest Collegiate Forensics Association
Spring 1997 Championships Tournament
Los Angeles Valley College
February 28- March 2, 1997

Round 1: This house would (THW) ban genetic cloning.
Round 2: THB computers are the answer.
Round 3: THB spaceship earth is crashing.
Round 4: THB that patriotism is misguided.
Round 5: TH would not worship at the temple of sport.
Round 6: THW exterminate capital punishment.
Octofinals (Open Div.): THB special interests have ruined democracy.
Octofinals (Novice Div.): THB advertising degrades the quality of life.
Quarterfinals: THB that reality is just a linguistic construction.
Semifinals: THB that crime pays.
Finals: THB that we have sold our souls for financial gain.

Parliamentary Debate Resolutions
The Regis University Invitational
Regis University
Posted to the parli-l 11/12/96 by Marcus Paroske

Round 1: TH supports an across the board tax cut.
Round 2: THB the poverty of the third world is the fault of the first world.
Round 3: TH rejects the American way of life.
Round 4: THB the truth is out there.
Round 5: THB the blood of Bosnia has stained American hands.
Round 6: THB competition is over emphasized in the United States.
Quarterfinals: THB negative political advertising is significantly detrimental to the democratic process.
Semifinals: THB privacy protections have become too extreme in the United States.
Finals: The system of justice, in this House, should be retributive, not distributive.

Appendix D – Forensics Fellow Member Questionnaire

1997-98 PLNC FORENSICS FELLOWS

MEMBER QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME: ______________________________

DEPARTMENT: ______________________________

OFFICE PHONE: ______________________________

E MAIL ADDRESS: ______________________________

MAJOR AREAS OF INSTRUCTION (TOPICS OR CLASSES TAUGHT):

____

____

____

____

OTHER AREAS OF INTEREST AND STUDY:

____

____

____

____

ANTICIPATED SCHEDULING CONSTRAINTS:

Please list times when you absolutely can not meet due to standing obligations such as class times, standard group meeting times, etc. We are primarily looking at weekdays (except Fridays) from 3:00 to 8:00 from which we will select potential meeting times. Remember, to keep from abusing your time you will probably only be asked to help at one session per semester.

Mondays Tuesdays Wednesdays Thursdays

In addition to parliamentary debate, our speech team participates in the following individual events:

INTERPRETATION SPEECHES
- Dramatic Interpretation
- Prose Interpretation
- Poetry Interpretation
- Duo Dramatic Interpretation

LIMITED PREP SPEECHES
- Impromptu Speaking
- Extemporaneous Speaking

PLATFORM SPEECHES
- Persuasion
- Informative
- Speech to Entertain
- Rhetorical Criticism

PLATFORM SPEECH IDEAS:

This next section is a chance to list any ideas you may have for innovative yet significant topic ideas or titles in literature that would make a compelling speech or story. We have little control over the limited preparation topics and the studying and research for Parliamentary Debate will greatly assist us in these events. There are however many topics from your disciplines or areas of study that might make great topics for student researched and written platform speeches. These topic areas should probably not be the overdone ideas like Capital Punishment, Gun Control, or abortion. The more cutting edge, unique, and current the better. It should also be socially significant. Please list any such topic ideas that come to mind here:

INTERPRETATION SELECTION IDEAS:

This section is asking you to think back on great (use your own slant on what great might be) or enjoyable works of literature. Can you remember the author and title of a particularly compelling piece of poetry, prose or drama that you have read or seen or heard lately or even from long ago? If it moved you chances are others will be moved by it also if it is interpreted well. What are your favorites? Our students are always looking for good ideas of powerful (or subtly powerful) literary selections. Any ideas you have would be appreciated. We will compile an idea file and add to it as people remember others. Please feel free to drop me a note if you think of others later. Thanks so much.

Abstract: Presumption as a part of formal debate is examined in this paper, which discusses Richard Whately's ideas about presumption and burden of proof in argumentation, how these ideas have been applied as paradigms and judging criteria in competitive debate, and how these same ideas fit into the practice of parliamentary debate. General conclusions about broad applications of debate "rules" are drawn, then, from this example, and suggestions are made for future study.

PRESUMPTION IN PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE: EXAMINING WHATELY'S IDEAS AND THEIR APPLICATION TO AN EMERGING AND EVOLVING DEBATE STYLE

Tammy Duvanel Unruh
Direcetor of Forensics
Bethel College, North Newton, KS

Most debate coaches introduce the term "presumption" to their student charges as a negative position by which one could argue that the *status quo* was presumed to be "innocent" and had to be proven "guilty" before the judge could vote for the affirmative--that the "burden of proof" is on the affirmative. The negative can sit back and, with that infamous "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" line of reasoning, win any round where "harm" or "significance" seemed questionable by simply claiming presumption. Policy debaters are taught that, most of the time, judges understand the phrase "innocent until proven guilty" and agree with the line of reasoning that advocating change for the sake of change is rarely justified and that the damage presented by the affirmative to be acceptable must truly offset the risks of change. Presumption functions as construct; a debate-rules "given"; a monolithic advantage for the *status quo* in most policy debate rounds (Sproule, 1976, p. 115). In their textbook *The Art and Practice of Argumentation and Debate*, Hill and Leeman (1997) stated, "For many years, scholars have treated presumption as a fixed or *stipulated* convention of the debate process. Presumption is stipulated to a particular entity (belief, action, institution, person, and so on) before the interaction begins, and that entity is assumed to retain its argumentative ground until the burden of proof is fulfilled" (p. 144). These same authors stated later, "In a formal debate, the negative always has presumption assigned via the stipulated dimension and the affirmative always has the corollary burden of proof" (p. 148). Of course, such a policy debate-based view of presumption as part of rhetorical communication, while perhaps helpful as a way of coming to a decision in debate rounds, certainly limits the possible understanding of the theory. This paper will discuss Richard Whately's writing about presumption and burden of proof in argumentation, how these ideas have been applied as paradigms and judging criteria in competitive debate, and how these same ideas fit (or do not fit) into the practice of parliamentary debate. Finally, some conclusions about broad application of debate rules are drawn from this example, and suggestions are made for future study.

Richard Whately wrote and rewrote the sections of his *Elements of Rhetoric* dealing with the theory of presumption and burden of proof during the period 1830 to 1846. He first argued that presumption operated in favor of an existing institution, an accused person or book, and prevailing opinion. "As a result, a burden of proof falls on those who (1) propose alterations in existing institutions, (2) make accusations in court and (3) maintain an opinion contrary to the prevailing one" (Sproule, p. 118). While Whately was the first rhetorician to use terms common in courts of law to discuss persuasion, J. Michael Sproule (1976), in *Communication Monographs*, asserted that Whately's theory of presumption is much more than the convenient mating of jurisprudential terms to the study of rhetorical communication. Sproule argued what is important in studying Whately is not his initial claims alone, but evolution of the Archbishop's theory from an essentially rule-based or legal entity, as described in the early versions of the *Elements*, to an audience-based understanding of argumentation and persuasion. Sproule saw the gradual development as indicative of "substantial changes in [Whately's] viewpoint regarding the agency of assignment [of presumption] and the nature of the advantage gained [by the same]" (p. 123).

Most easily observable is Whately's attitude toward audience. In early discussions of presumption, the audience is passive--merely observing the argument. Later, Whately wrote "in any one question the Presumption will often be found to lie on different sides, in respect of different parties" (p. 120) and, by 1836, Whately saw presumption as determined by sociological factors, such as group membership, and psychological factors, such as novelty, arguing that at times, assigned or stipulated presumption is correctly rebutted or even overturned by new or novel ideas. Whately's attitude toward audience and their role in assigning and determining the importance of presumption in making decisions culminated in Whately's statement that "advocates should not always expect an otherwise plausible presumption to be perceived by a given set of auditors. Presumption was an advantage, but an unrecognized advantage counted for little." Instead, in making a decision, "the individual seeks the evidence, judges its merits, and, in the absence of demonstrable proof, convinces himself of the certitude of the proposition"--a far cry from the passive audience of Whately's early writing (p. 123).

Critics of Whately saw no such explainable or understandable evolution of thought, but merely the confusion of the Archbishop about his own system. Gary Cronkhite (1966), for example, identified three types of presumptions in Whately--psychological, legal and assertive--and claimed that these were not types of presumption at all, but would be better described as deference or consensus. He went on to claim that the least confusing rule and the rule best employed in extra-legal argument is simply "He who asserts must prove"(p. 270-271). The understanding of the audience as to what constitutes proof was not a part of the consideration of presumption; the purpose of presumption was to assign the duty of proving assertions, not determining what would constitute that proof.

Having discussed Whately's theory of presumption, an examination of the application of these ideas to competitive debate is appropriate. As discussed above, in traditional policy debate, presumption lies with the *status quo* and, therefore, the negative side of the debate. This view is in alignment with Whately's early writing about presumption. As Hill and Leeman point out, "the legislative model [of presumption] carries no assumption that the *status quo* is good, only that the change might be worse" (p.145). The judge, following a standard stock-issue or policy-maker paradigm, would consider presumption as the negative's "right to do no more than ask 'Why?'"(Cronkhite, 273-4) and thus advocate no change in the current system unless the affirmative presented compelling evidence of significant, continuing harm or of a comparatively advantageous way of performing a task that existed and was precluded manifestation by the current method of handling the same situation. "The advocate with presumption has no responsibility to justify her or his preoccupation of argumentative ground until the advocate with the burden of proof provides sufficient reason to question that preoccupation" (Hill et al., p. 147). Presumption also instructs a judge adopting a hypothesis-testing paradigm. In their discussion of the hypo-testing paradigm, Patterson and Zarefsky assert that presumption "indicates which side will be presumed correct in the absence of argument to the contrary" and, additionally, offer a "normative principle": "the fundamental presumption ought to rest against the resolution in order to assure that the resolution receives a through and rigorous test" (Lee & Lee, 1985, p. 169).

In "value" debate, presumption lies with the hierarchy of values maintained by the *status quo*. Rather than a legislative understanding of presumption, as discussed above in the realm of policy debate, presumption in value debate is based more on a legal understanding of presumption--that the accuser (here the affirmative) must prove the guilt of the defendant. The burden of the affirmative, then, is to prove one of two things: either the hierarchy of values maintained by the *status quo* is flawed and should be rearranged, or some policy or group of policies in place in the *status quo* does not reflect the hierarchy of values and should be changed. In the first scenario, a policy or several policies are presented to prove the skew in values--proof of "guilt"--then the affirmative proposes a reordering of values, which change in these same policies would demonstrate. In the second scenario, a proposition for change of a policy or policies is presented to bring certain policies into line with the value hierarchy--the *status quo* would be proven "guilty" of violating its own standards. While the nature of the "real-world application/theoretic value structure" argument may be an exercise in "chicken-and-egg" logic, the idea of legal presumption as a negative area of argumentation is clear. The negative can rest in the position of presumption until the affirmative shows bad value-ordering or bad policies in that values are violated, maintaining its "innocence" until good and sufficient reasons proving "guilt" and justifying change are advanced. A judge can certainly take a traditional policy-maker position and base a decision on the policy changes advocated.

However, when making a decision, the debaters often ask the judge in a value debate round, especially as value debate is currently practiced on the CEDA circuit, to "weigh" one value against another or to decide which side more adequately upholds one value, often through means of a criterion for judgement. Affirmatives assert that traditional, stipulated presumption is a less important construct for decision-making than an applied "decision-rule" based on competing values--a type of what Whately called psychological presumption, reflecting what a particular person values and what that individual is likely to consider a "good reason" to consider an affirmative proposition (Hill et al., p. 145). Cronkhite takes issue with this sort of presumption as not being presumption at all:

> [T]he purpose of assigning presumption is to determine which side has the burden of proof . . . The . . . modification of this position which suggests that presumption always lies with morality, 'rectitude,' orthodoxy, the 'true, right or expedient,' or 'whatever accords with the natural laws of Providence,' [cannot be made because] arguments usually result from conflicts between two views of what is moral, true, or orthodox. How, then could presumption be assigned to one or the other?" (p.271)

Arnie Madsen and Allan D. Louden (1987), in the *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, quoted Matlon:

> "Definitions of presumption have undergone considerable change in recent years . . . [h]owever, all positions have one common theme, namely [s]he who assumes the burden of proof must produce the preponderance of argument" (p. 92).

Madsen and Louden then go on to reason

> "While this may be correct, it does not justify presumption in value debate, to the extent its requisite burden of proof is one which can apply to both the affirmative and the negative" (p. 92).

Stipulated presumption, then, may serve as a window through which to view policy issues and value hierarchy issues as they emerge in value debate rounds, but contention exists as to the role of any sort of presumption when determining what a judge values or should "weigh" when considering values at odds.

This is the milieu into which parliamentary debate as an emerging debate style must step. Presumption, while still infinitely valuable as a construct for legislatively modeled policy debate, may not be useful in value debate, especially in areas outside policy consideration. As Whately described the situation in the nineteenth century, presumption may exist in theory, but if it is not seen as an advantage in the mind of the audience, it is useless as a means to advocate an action. An examination of how debaters and critics might evoke presumption in parliamentary debate rounds is in order.

Some rounds of parliamentary debate certainly suggest a wholehearted adoption of a traditional legislative or legal understanding of presumption. Consider a debate based on the resolution "This House would enact campaign finance reform." Obviously, a straightforward interpretation of this prescriptive resolution would place the government in a position of advocating change from the current practice of campaign financing or the current regulation of campaign finances. Either way, the opposition is granted the presumption--the way things are currently being handled is presumed to be adequate until some problem, abuse, injustice or like cause large enough to mandate a change is presented by the government.

However, the current practices of parliamentary debate, and especially those practices of the government's right to define terms in the resolution and ground for debate, strain a traditional understanding of presumption as an always-and-only negative/opposition advantage. A debate on the metaphoric resolution "The house believes that blue is better than red," for example, in which the government defines "blue" as Capitalism and "red" as Communism, calls for debate about two competing economic systems. Both teams must advance reasons for the superiority of their system; neither side could win the debate by merely asking "Why?" (Assuming the debate takes place in the United States, when the government team has defined the resolution's terms in such a way as to place themselves in a position advocating Capitalism, any presumption based merely on the idea that this US *status quo* is capitalist is awarded to the government, not the opposition.) Certainly, if presumption in some form exists, it is located in the judge or audience's understanding of these economic systems and not awarded by an examination of who asserts and therefore proves.

Presumption, then, at least of the stipulated, construct variety, may not exist in all rounds of parliamentary debate. Perhaps it should not. Ronald Lee and Karen King Lee (1985), writing in the *Central States Speech Journal*, suggest four specific criticisms of a rule-based approach to presumption in argumentation, three of which are especially compelling and should cause the parliamentary community to examine carefully how tightly it wishes to embrace presumption (or any rule) as an always-present, defining construct in debate rounds. First, the authors cite a lack of what they call magnetism, noting that

> "[a] rule reports on procedure rather than the speaker's interests. Rules are external to the feeling of the speaker and do not logically commit the interlocutor to the psychological consequences of the statement" (p. 169).

Second,

> [a] rule-based approach to presumption cannot account for the *direction of the listeners' interests*. Rules do not have persuasive impact beyond whatever implicit or explicit force the accompanying sanctions may have. Whatever dynamic dimension the meaning of presumption may entail, the use of rules makes this an irrelevant consideration. To engage a rule is to make a statement about procedure rather than to suggest to listeners that the rhetorical force of presumption speaks to intensify or redirect their interests (p.170).

If the parliamentary debate community wishes to maintain public accessibility to the activity as a goal, surely attention must be paid to always keeping rules secondary to persuasive, logical argumentation as the major reason for decision. Third, a rule-based approach regarding presumption cannot allow intelligent disagreement over the assignment of presumption.

> "Competing presumptions characterize church and state disputes, the deference to authority when two disciplines clash, and the common struggle between value pairs such as freedom and responsibility or the right to know and the right to privacy" (p.170);

certainly the sort of arguments we all wish to hear in parliamentary debate rounds and the sort of topics where students receive the greatest benefit of the activity as they are forced to consider multidimensional issues from varying sides.

Cronkhite stated that his purpose in writing was "not to determine what the term [presumption] means, for its meaning for any given group can best be determined empirically" (p. 270). A legitimate arena for observation and discussion, then, is whether the parliamentary debate community wishes to use the current understanding of presumption as advanced by the NDT and CEDA or to come up with its own way of understanding the idea of presumption.

Clearly, the use of presumption to determine which side in an argument must assume the burden of proof seems logical in situations where a prescriptive resolution indicates that the government advocate change in policy. The judge is clearly able to enter the round in a policy-maker role, and the opposition can confidently occupy the ground it is given--secure that, no matter how small their territory is, the burden of proof falls on the government. Especially considering the fact that parliamentary topics are often as fresh as the morning news, presumption and the risk in scantlyconsidered change are important ideas about which the opposition must be able to argue fluently to overcome the audience's interest in the "novel and current" over the "tried and true" and boring *status quo*.

However, demanding a fixed rule regarding presumption it probably not to the advantage of parliamentary debate. While relying heavily on the judge's ideas of what constitutes proof and who has to supply what amount of it, rounds in which both sides must assert and prove can be educational and allow for discussion of topics where the presumption isn't easily seen if it exists at all. If success in parliamentary debate is going to remain dependent upon the debaters' abilities to "read" an audience and on his or her ability to think quickly and not on some evocation of rules specific to the genre that mean little to nothing outside of a debate round, then the parliamentary debaters, coaches, and judges must guard against implementing rules from other forms of debate that may not apply readily to the parliamentary format.

Several areas for further study are apparent. An analysis of some of the traditional constructs and stock issues in policy and value debate and their possible application or misapplication in parliamentary debate is needful. For example, the stock issue of solvency has frustrated teams attempting to debate the policy implications of parliamentary resolutions. Resolutionality--the interpretation of the resolution advanced by the government and how accurately it mirrors the actual resolution--could be examined in light of topicality theory.

Also, a reexamination of the standard theorists, like Whately, and musing about how their theories can apply to the new genre of debate would provide an excellent area of primary source research and would allow consideration of these ideas on their own merits and not as they have been filtered through policy and value debate lenses in the past.

Whately's was a "contextualist" view of language and meaning, evidenced by his assertion that *use* is "the only competent authority" in determing the meaning of words (McKerrow, 1988, p. 219). Certainly we as responsible coaches, judges, and debaters should use a variety of arguments and argumentation theories to advocate our positions, and let our intelligent use of those types and theories instruct our debating rather than invoking rules of debate-types past to shape our emerging and evolving style of debate.

Selected Bibliography

Cronkhite, G. (1966). The locus of presumption. Central States Speech Journal, 17, 270-76.

Hill, B. & Leeman, R. W. (1997). The art and practice of argumentation and debate. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Lee, R., & Lee, K. K. (1985). Reconsidering Whately's folly: An emotive treatment of presumption. Central States Speech Journal, 36, 164-177.

Madsen, A. & Louden, A. D. (1987). Jurisdiction and the evaluation of topicality. Journal of the America Forensic Association, 24, 73-94.

McKerrow, R. E. (1988). Whately's philosophy of language. Southern Speech Communication Journal, 53, 211-226.

Sproule, J. Michael. (1976). The psychological burden of proof: One the evolutionary development of Richard Whately's theory of presumption. Speech Monographs, 53, 115-129.

FORENSICS EDUCATION AND TOURNAMENT MANAGEMENT

Joel Hefling
Director of Forensics
South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD

When one thinks about managing a forensics tournament, frequently the components of that process that come to mind are the tasks of scheduling rooms, securing judges, ordering trophies and food, scheduling the rounds and getting through the awards ceremony as quickly and easily as possible. As the time draws nearer for the tournament to begin, there may be some details that escape the director's attention. At this time, the tournament director may become painfully aware of the admonitions presented by Hunsinger, Terry, and Wood (1970) when they point out that the director ". . . should not try to do everything by himself." So the resourceful director may take stock of what is left to be done and begin to assign tasks to overworked graduate students, eager undergraduate students, or reluctant but well-intentioned colleagues. Into this cauldron of last-minute-but-essential tasks falls the series of "Oh, anyone can do this" jobs: preparing ballots, writing extemp questions, setting up tab sheets, making fee sheets, preparing impromptu topics, ordering snacks for coaches and judges, making directional signs. This paper will focus on two duties that probably should be plucked from the cauldron and placed much earlier on the agenda for the tournament director: the preparation of extemp questions and impromptu topics. The management of these two events deserves greater attention than it frequently gets, and the results probably will justify the extra attention given to each.

We are reminded (Faules, Rieke & Rhodes, 1978) that "[t]he direction of a good forensics tournament can be one of the most difficult and challenging responsibilities of the director." The current experience of most tournament directors would suggest that that statement is very accurate. It is even more pertinent when we consider, along with the authors, the position of a director who has no previous experience in running a tournament. The ranks of this group seems to be growing fairly rapidly with the growing number of experienced tournament directors who are retiring or leaving the coaching profession. Before handing novice tournament directors a handbook explaining how to direct a tournament, it may be far more profitable to heed to more admonitions from Faules, Rieke, and Rhodes. They point out that "[t]he cardinal principle of tournament management is that a forensics tournament should be run for the educational benefit of the participants," and they indicate further that the tournament director and staff should do everything possible "to maximize the educational value of the meet" (1978). The educational value and benefits should be the driving factors behind the management of a tournament, and especially of the preparation of extemp questions and impromptu topics.

It may be appropriate to briefly review the history of extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking. Donald W. Klopf (1990) indicates in Coaching and Directing Forensics that an extemp speech was ". . . a speech prepared in advance but neither written out nor memorized." He further points out that contestants had the option of presenting speeches either to persuade or to inform, and that there was little similarity among extemp contests, other than that the subject areas were ". . . usually . . . derived from current events, especially contemporary international and national problems" (226). While topics are stated as questions "in a few contests," students have the option of taking a position either for or against the position advocated in the question (227). In their article "Impromptu and Extemporaneous Speaking," McKissick, Tannenbaum and Hoffman (1994) point out to extemporaneous speaking students that extemp topics ". . . typically concern themselves with current events, and are usually expressed as a question you are expected to answer" (70). Brent Oberg, in Forensics: The Winner's Guide to Speech Contests (1995), intended primarily for high school students, indicates that extemp speaking topics ". . . deal with current issues and events and are stated as questions. Students are therefore asked to answer a designated question and support their answer" (67). Most sources include extensive suggestions for the extemporaneous speakers and coaches regarding research, preparation and delivery. There are no suggestions or guidelines given for the writers of extemp questions or topics. Only Klopf makes any reference to the preparation of extemp questions with his comment that ". . . topics may have been formulated by a qualified person who is not connected with the forensic programs of any of the participating schools" (226).

For impromptu speaking, there seems to be even less information available about the selection or preparation of topics. Klopf refers to the methods students may use to prepare for impromptu speaking and discusses the merits of impromptu speaking in general, concluding with qualifications needed by students to be successful impromptu speakers (232-233). Others (McKissick, Tannenbaum and Hoffman (1994) and Oberg (1995)) provide explanations of the rules and guidelines for the student speakers, with virtually no mention made of the types of topics to be expected or how to prepare the topics for the speakers.

It would seem that the tournament director who needs to develop extemporaneous speaking questions and impromptu speaking topics might be faced with a dilemma, especially if she/he has no experience in those areas. The novice tournament director may be left at the mercy of volunteers who may or may not have any better knowledge of developing topics. Forensics colleagues may be willing to provide topics and questions, but this probably won't help the novice director learn how to write extemp questions or develop impromptu topics. Sometimes those who have experience writing extemp questions and developing impromptu topics are not much better at the process than those with no experience. It may be important to identify some criteria, which can be used to guide tournament directors and their staff in the process of developing appropriate and effective topics for the limited preparation events.

Klopf (1990) identified two questions initially intended to guide the student in choosing his/her topic. Those questions can be helpful in guiding the writer of extemp questions: "Is the topic significant, interesting to the speaker and the audience, and suitable for the contest? Is pertinent information available in the student's files?" (228). Two aspects of these questions deserve closer scrutiny. "Is the topic . . . suitable for the contest?" This may be an important factor to consider. Topics appropriate for collegiate competition may not be appropriate for high school students. Topics appropriate for novice competitors may not be suitable for more experienced speakers. Topics written at the beginning of the competition year may not be appropriate for competition at the end of the year. Suitability may be dictated by the level of competition and by the amount of experience of the competitors. The challenge for the tournament director is determining which of the speakers are novices and which are more experienced. In an open division, that may be impossible and impractical. The director then will need to develop questions that will be appropriate for novices, and at the same time allow more experienced speakers opportunities to develop speeches that are more complex and more appropriate for their level of experience. It may be even more important for the tournament director to consider the time in the academic year that the tournament is held. Tournaments held earlier in the year may be better served with topics that are more appropriate for beginning speakers. As the competitive year progresses, the questions could become progressively more challenging. It is important to realize, however, that there will be students who are beginning their competition throughout the year. Second semester topics need to allow those beginning speakers the option of selecting topics or developing speeches that are consistent with their level of experience.

Another aspect of Klopf's question deserves discussion. "Is pertinent information available in the student's files?" In theory, extemp speakers should have similar files of information. Some sources may vary, but the amount of material should be similar. In reality, this is rarely true. Novice speakers may have limited material in their files. New programs may have limited resources available to them. Students coming from a classroom setting may have even more limited resources. Students from programs with large budgets and a large number of returning students may have more extensive resources available to them, including the use of electronic retrieval systems. The tournament director needs to be aware of these factors and attempt to write topics that will allow students in each of the categories to develop appropriate speeches, utilizing the experience and resources available to them. Knowing something about the programs that will be attending the tournament will help the tournament director determine the most effective way to approach topic development. It would seem to be inappropriate to assume that all students will have access to electronic retrieval systems if the schools attending the tournament are two-year schools, or schools with budget problems, or schools who use the tournament setting as an extension of the classroom experience for their students.

Thus far, this discussion has focused primarily on the development of topics/questions for extemporaneous speaking, with little attention given to the development of impromptu speaking topics. That lack of discussion here is a reflection of the lack of discussion found in much of the forensics literature. It is possible to find detailed suggestions for the impromptu speaker about structure, preparation, delivery, and topic analysis. It is possible to find some hints for the coach of the impromptu speaker about structure, preparation, delivery, topic analysis, and practice. But it is very difficult to locate suggestions for the tournament director that will provide help in developing topics. The director may be able to glean some hints from the advice given to speakers and coaches, and draw some conclusions from the sample topics provided, but little help is available about where to look to find topics, or how to develop a variety of topics for speakers with varying levels of proficiency. Discussions about impromptu speaking at least include some samples of possible topics; discussions about extemporaneous speaking generally do not. The prevailing attitude seems to be that the tournament director will be able to read the event description and intuitively know how to write appropriate questions or develop effective topics. For a novice tournament director, or a willing but untrained assistant or staff member, the whole experience can be very frustrating and discouraging.

In finding solutions to the dilemma of developing high quality, appropriate extemporaneous and impromptu topics, it may be essential to take a step back, although not a step backward. In stepping back and looking at the broad picture of forensics, we must be reminded frequently that we are considered forensic educators, that we are in the field of education, and that we use forensics competition as a tool to educate our students. Those are the arguments that Directors of Forensics frequently use with departmental administrators and funding organizations. Faules, Rieke and Rhodes, as mentioned earlier, are explicit in their admonition to the tournament director. "The cardinal principle of tournament management is that a forensics tournament should be run for the educational benefit of the participants" (1978). This position is supported by Hunsinger, Terry and Wood in Managing Forensic Tournaments. They point out that the tournament director ". . . is a teacher, first and foremost." They go on to indicate that the tournament itself is a larger educational experience, and indicate that the tournament director ". . . should take the educator's point of view in all his work. His purpose should be primarily the education of students" (22).

At the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events in 1988, Sheryl Friedley, in her article "Ethical Considerations for Forensic Educators," indicated another perspective to be considered. "Forensic educators must strive to treat all students fairly and promote equality of opportunity for all participants regardless of sex, race, physical handicaps, or other potentially discriminating variables" (85). Sound ethical practices, and federal laws, tend to prevent discriminatory behavior based on sex, race, or physical considerations. But some students may feel disadvantaged when they encounter extemporaneous questions or impromptu topics that are beyond the scope of their experience or capability as a novice speaker. Students who participate in a tournament as part of a classroom experience may be discouraged and feel demeaned because they are not privy to the meaning of some of the terminology or the implied expectations inherent in some extemp questions or impromptu topics. There are far too many writers of questions and developers of topics who seem to take pleasure in watching students struggle with obscure impromptu topics or complex and difficult extemp questions. While it may be appropriate to challenge students to accomplish more difficult tasks, it is not appropriate to provide them with obstacles that will diminish them as a person. It is not possible for a coach to prepare all students in advance of every tournament to expect all of the idiosyncrasies that may appear in extemp questions and impromptu topics. A positive learning experience has not been provided when the coach must spend several hours after a tournament trying to make the students feel better about themselves and the efforts they have expended in trying to deal with capriciously developed topics.

Current research and information about learning styles and multiple intelligences indicate that more careful attention should be given to the development of extemp and impromptu topics. Friedley's ". . . other potentially discriminating variables" (85) could easily include students with various learning styles that are not accommodated by poorly developed topics. It would seem to be appropriate to develop a greater variety of types of questions in extemp or topics in impromptu in order to allow students greater flexibility in developing their speeches.

Some of the steps to be taken by tournament directors to improve the opportunities for students in extemp and impromptu may seem fairly obvious. Each of the following suggestions can be expanded and developed further. Each also implies some additional work on the part of the tournament director or the writers of extemp questions and developers of impromptu topics.

Assigning the task of developing topics should not be taken lightly or capriciously. Those who write questions or develop topics need to be given some guidance by the tournament director, so that topics will reinforce the educational aspects of the tournament experience. It may be necessary for the tournament director to identify those educational goals, so that all members of the tournament staff are working toward the same end.

Care must be taken in word choice, especially in extemp questions, in order to allow students greater opportunities to utilize their own particular abilities, experience, and resources. There is little or no positive educational value in using language that student speakers cannot understand.

The tournament director needs to proofread the topics developed for both extemp and impromptu. In reality, the final responsibility for a rewarding educational tournament experience rests with the director. Proofreading the topics will help the director feel more comfortable in accepting that responsibility.

In extemporaneous speaking, simpler questions may be better than more complex ones. Less experienced speakers, or those with limited resources, will not be disadvantaged by the complexity of the question or the implied expected approach. Experienced speakers, or those with more extensive resources, will be able to utilize their experience and their sources. In fact, they probably should be expected to do that.

In impromptu speaking, topics that move away from the more traditional proverbs or quotations, whether they are cartoons, objects or other stimuli, need to carry with them some explanation of what is expected of the student. That information will also provide the judges with some guidelines for evaluating the students' efforts.

These suggestions may seem fairly conservative and traditional. They are intended to be reminders that progress should not be made at the expense of the educational experience of the students involved in the activity. As improvements are made in tournament management practices and procedures, we must not lose sight of the educational goals and benefits of the activity. A closer look at the educational roots of this activity may be in order.

Friedley points out that ". . . forensic educators must preserve the educational goals of the activity" (85). It will be helpful to identify the educational goals of not only the activity but also of individual tournaments. Each tournament director needs to identify those goals for her or his own tournament, and then take steps to ensure that those goals are met. Forensic educators and the activity can benefit from greater utilization of information about learning styles and multiple intelligences. If we are willing to promote forensics as an extension of a traditional classroom, then we must be willing to utilize in forensics practice the educational techniques implemented in that classroom.

References

Faules, D. F., Rieke, R. D. & Rhodes, J. Directing forensics. Denver: Morton Publishing Company, 1978.

Friedley, S. A. Ethical considerations for forensic educators, in Schnoor, L. & Karns, V. (Eds.). (1989). Perspectives on Individual Events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Mankato, MN: Mankato State University.

Hunsinger, P. Terry, D. R. & Wood, V. (1970). Managing forensic tournaments. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

Klopf, D. W. (1990). Coaching and directing forensics. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

McKissick, A., Tannenbaum, S. & Hoffman, D. (1994). Impromptu and Extemporaneous Speaking, in Winebrenner, T. C. (ed.). Intercollegiate forensics. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Oberg, B. C. (1995). Forensics: The winner's guide to speech contests. Colorado Springs, CO: Meriwether Publishing Ltd.

Supplemental Resources

Lazear, D. (1991). Seven ways of knowing: Teaching for multiple intelligences. (2nd ed.). Arlington Heights, IL: IRI/Skylight Training and Publishing, Inc., 1991.

Information about learning styles can be obtained from a number of sources, many available from most college and university Education Divisions.

Abstract: Among the most significant changes in the evolution of forensic activities has been the growth of specialized participation, with students, educators, and programs focusing on debate or individual events. The manifestations of this specialization are seen in the decreasing number of tournaments offering opportunities for students to compete in both categories of competition. While some preservation of broad-based participation is seen with the growing popularity of parliamentary formats, the move away from broad-based participation is clear. This trend is argued to be alarming due to its negative impact on forensics pedagogy, the training of forensics educators, and the forensics laboratory. Suggestions for compromise are offered.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY?
THE IMPACT OF SPECIALIZED TOURNAMENTS ON FORENSICS PEDAGOGY, FORENSICS PROFESSIONALS, AND THE FORENSICS LABORATORY

Scott Jensen
Director of Forensics
Webster University, St. Louis, MO

By some accounts collegiate forensics has never been stronger. Countless debate formats and individual events are available to the forensic student. The activity has more organizations and national tournaments than Willy Wonka has chocolate. Never before have so many choices been available to the forensic student and educator. As positive as this may appear, I argue that this proliferation of forensic alternatives is leading our activity down a path of disunion that should be alarming to those concerned with the pedagogical value of forensics. The time has come for members of our activity to dismiss competitive specialization and embrace the diversity, cooperativeness, and educational richness that is associated with a broad-based forensic laboratory. The place to begin this reversal in trends is the forensic tournament. I first outline the situation as it exists today and the problems that it creates. Alternatives will be suggested that allow all members of the forensic community the freedom to choose without perpetuating an environment of focus.

The Situation

It has become increasingly difficult for forensic programs and their students and professional members to actively embrace both individual events and debate. The notion of debate has changed significantly in recent years, growing into a competitive arena that offers research-oriented debate (in both team and individual formats) through several organizations, as well as parliamentary debate--a format that encourages a blend of critical thinking and effective presentational skills. Meanwhile, at least 11 individual events are available to competitors through two national organizations and several regional and state groups. Added to these opportunities are three honorary fraternities with which programs and their members can affiliate.

Such range in choice makes it problematic for programs that wish to compete in a breadth of forensic events. Preston (1997), in outlining competitive options available to programs, writes, "without comprehensive staff and budget resources, having a forensics program to encompass all types mentioned in this article would be illusory and in some instances pedagogically contradictory" (p. 274). Earlier in this decade, most programs reported that they sought to provide broad-based opportunities for their students (Jensen, 1993). The climate now seems to have changed. Bartanen (1996), in perhaps the most comprehensive assessment of forensics to date, reports several alarming survey results. When asking respondents questions regarding diversity, mean scores consistently revealed feelings that diversity in participation was discouraged in terms of teaching, communication styles, and argument. Mean scores also revealed that respondents view forensics as too factionalized, and that the forensic community is doing too little to attract diverse student participation, educators, and judging pools.

A review of the 1997 Intercollegiate Tournament Calendar revealed that a majority (113) of the 225 tournaments listed offer only one category of forensic events (debate, individual events, or student congress). Furthermore, most tournaments that offer both debate and individual events include only parliamentary and/or Lincoln-Douglas formats (60, compared with seven that offer team policy and individual events). Only 43 tournaments advertise opportunities for multiple debate formats (including team policy) and individual events (Hefling, 1997). These numbers are further misleading because many of the tournaments that allow team policy debate and individual events are administered within a schedule that precludes students from competing in both individual events and debate. While some opportunities for broad-based programs do exist, these tournaments are hosted in several different regions of the country, making it unlikely that a broad-based program can attend more than the few that may (or may not) be in its region. Clearly, it is becoming extremely difficult for programs to enter students in a variety of forensic events during one weekend.

Exacerbating the present ills within our activity is the number of national, regional, and state organizations that are vying for memberships. As programs affiliate with these organizations, they purchase opportunities to participate in post-season tournaments. With the exception of honorary fraternities, forensic organizations focus on individual events, or single forms of debate. As programs join these groups they often push themselves into a position of focus, unless their resources allow them to compete in a variety of national tournaments and event formats. More and more, members of the community are recognizing winners of the specialized national tournaments as the "true" national champions, creating a perception that the fraternal tournaments are less competitive or illegitimate as national events.

Finally, there is the program that offers both debate and individual events to its students, but through independent squads. These schools sponsor individual event and debate squads, sometimes with independent budgets, but almost always with separate student memberships. While the school embraces the breadth of our activity, it frequently is not structurally possible for students to benefit from a broad range of forensic participation. Further, the separation within the program may send the message that focus is more sound than breadth, furthering support for specialization in the mind of its participants.

The Problem

The move of collegiate forensics toward increased specialization has been documented. What merits further discussion are the problems that stem from such focus. Parson (1984) noted at the Second Developmental Conference on Forensics:

> The major problem facing American forensics in 1984 is increased fragmentation . . . Someone once remarked that where you will find four Lutherans gathered together you will find four denominations of Lutherans. It is as if there is more strength in diversity than in unity, and the smaller the unit, the more tendency to split up. Besieged by outside forces--by inattentive administrators, inadequate budgets, unmanageable topics--the problem in American forensics is compounded by increased fragmentation and the desire to show that one's particular area of specialization is better, more important, or more substantial than other areas . . . Forensics is, indeed, a House Divided; how long it stands depends to large measure on how long it remains divided (p. 47).

This warning, now 13 years in the past, is more appropriate than ever in 1997. While the overriding concern created by specialization is the very survival of forensics, this paper considers four more specific problems.

Student Specialization

With fewer opportunities available for students wishing to cross-over between debate and individual events, more specialized forensic students are certain to be the result of our present trends. Each forensic event has its own merit. While individual events teach a variety of ways to communicate, debate challenges students to think critically and defend positions. While parliamentary debate focuses on quick thinking and a blend of effective argument formation and communication, team policy debate can contribute greatly to research abilities and defending ideas through cross examination. Our laboratory can reach its greatest potential of contributing to its participants' growth when it includes a breadth of opportunities and recognition that each activity provides its own unique benefits (see, for example, Adamo, 1995; Treadaway, 1995). When our students specialize this potential is lost. Derryberry (1991) argues that "students gain more from forensic involvement if their preparation is varied and free of narrow restrictions" (p. 170).

Educator Specialization

As our students become more specialized, so too do our future forensic educators through a cyclical dynamic. In short--as our students graduate to positions as forensic educators they bring their specialization with them into their coaching and teaching. As their programs reflect specialization, new generations of focused students further ingrain the environment of specialization. Jensen (1996), in discussing trends in forensics, argues that "when these students [specialized] pursue forensic positions, they bring with them a limited framework of experiences that they will use to guide them as professional educators" (p. 3).

Bartanen (1996), in his textbook on directing forensics, touches on his view of the future training of forensic educators. Regarding high school teachers, he notes that "they may feel comfortable teaching public speaking but unqualified to teach debate" (p. 7). His conclusion, in light of present trends including specialization, is that "this does not bode well for the long-term health of the activity at either the high school or college level" (p. 7).

Programs are Forced into a Choice

Most forensic programs survive through their competitive ventures at tournaments. There is no doubt that, with the breakdown of tournaments offering only individual events, only debate, or both individual events and debate, programs are having more difficulty selecting tournaments at which all of their students can participate. As a person who has recently developed travel schedules for two programs in different parts of the United States, I can attest to the difficulty in finding tournaments at which my individual events, parliamentary, and CEDA/NDT students can compete. If my experience is representative, two conclusions can be drawn. First, few programs try to compete in the broad range of forensic events previously listed. Second, programs that do compete in a range of events are forced to travel an incredibly diversified schedule or frequently split their squads on weekends. Either of these manifestations result in the same problem: resources are stretched beyond their capacity.

Certainly some programs opt for an individual events or debate focus for any one of a number of reasons. While these choices have both benefits and drawbacks, the more pressing issue is the program that focuses not out of choice but out of budgetary necessity. This result is not fair to the student who desires to experience a breadth of forensic exposure, nor to the educator who desires to teach a breadth of forensic exposure. I fear that such forced choices are or will soon become the norm as specialization grows.

Individual Events and Debate as Competitors

As an educator who is active in both individual events and debate, I experience the best and worst of both worlds. I often hear criticism of each activity from participants in the other. Whether it is an individual event student or coach who insults a CEDA/NDT debater, a CEDA/NDT debater who criticizes an individual event or its participants, or someone who minimizes the lack of intensity they perceive to accompany parliamentary debate, it seems that an atmosphere of competitiveness between events is growing.

Alexander (1997) notes that separating individual event and debate activities encourages "the 'outsider' perspective that these are two disparate activities" (p. 278). He adds that such a perspective "contradicts how we define and defend what we do and why we do it" (p. 279). The ultimate danger in this separation is what Alexander calls borders of distinction:

> This formal separation of the activities feeds into a longstanding Western tradition of creating oppositional pairs. Though not intrinsically combative, oppositional categorization inevitably lends itself to distention: black/white, private/public, real/imagined, fact/fiction, debate/I.E. These borders of distinction demand separation. The insidious nature of this division results in derision; a derision of the other that questions form and functions (e.g., interpretative stance vs. debate delivery; I.E. judge vs. debate).

> The current trend creates gaps, chasms of difference, and prioritization of focus (p. 279).

Such competitiveness is probably not a surprise, given that increasingly these events have fewer participants that cross into other events. It is common for the majority of individuals at tournaments to be participants in either individual events or debate. At awards assemblies I see individual events participants stand for pentathlon winners and debate participants stand for top speakers. Not long ago it seems that everyone in an awards ceremony would stand to honor the accomplishments of students and programs, regardless of event. Such competitiveness will inevitably further the specialization and factionalization that is already becoming commonplace in the forensic community.

Solutions?

This paper argues that steps should be taken to endorse and provide opportunities that further breadth in the forensic community. Present trends suggest that this may in fact be the minority view. West (1997), a director of a broad-based program, provides a rationale for his choice:

> I cannot justify a thesis that in-depth teaching of critical thinking skills is of more "value" to our society than learning about the human condition through performance and analysis of texts. Nor can I justify a claim that the delivery skills inherent in some platform public speaking events is of greater good than the depth of analysis available through policy debate. I also believe that different students have different needs and interests, and that my job happens to be (by my own choice) to meet as many of those needs as possible (p. 263).

While programs and their administrators must ultimately choose their response to forensic's specialization, tournament directors can aid in providing options that make it possible for participants desiring breadth to experience a variety of forensic opportunities. Preston (1992), in outlining ethical considerations when managing tournaments, argued that tournaments should be scheduled in a way such that debaters are not limited in terms of debaters being only able to enter certain events. That way, schools that promote diversity are not arbitrarily penalized by having perhaps some of their best entries disqualified for no reason before a tournament begins (p. 8).

Design Tournament Schedules to Allow Cross-Over

Much has been said and written about how to administer tournaments in a manner that is both humane and efficient, while being responsive to the needs and desires of the forensic community. Some tournament directors' answer to the ideal tournament schedule has been to either offer only debate or individual events, or separate some debate formats from individual events.

While I am sympathetic with the call to reduce the average tournament burdens, I fear that the commonly accepted answer has been to disregard certain forensic opportunities. It appears that the greatest tension exists between CEDA/NDT debate and other factions of the forensic community. The rarest of tournaments in this year's AFA calendar is the one that offers both CEDA/NDT and individual events. Tournament managers can be influential in welcoming the programs and their participants who choose to participate in debate (any format) and individual events by allowing such range of participation at their tournaments.

First, tournament directors can experiment with schedules that allow maximum cross-over between debate and individual events. Such a schedule almost certainly must take place in a long two days or into a partial third day. When the availability of rooms and critics allow, a two-flight individual event tournament makes it easier to do things in two days, although an early start on the first day is essential.

Second, tournament directors can reserve one or two flights of individual events for cross-over from debate. While some individual events would still not be available to debaters, there would remain some opportunity to experience the value of broad-based participation.

Third, tournaments can capitalize on the increasingly popular individual event swing. Some swings now feature one tournament that includes both debate and individual events, while the second tournament offers just individual events. Within this format the tournament offering both categories of events can run them concurrently and still offer debaters exposure to individual events in the second tournament.

The fourth suggestion for tournament scheduling seems to be growing in popularity. Tournament directors can allow participants in some debate formats to also participate in individual events. While this makes sense, given the length of time it takes to complete a Lincoln-Douglas or parliamentary debate round, it also severs CEDA/NDT debaters from the remaining factions of the forensic community. Nevertheless, it is a better alternative than not allowing students any debate or individual event cross-over.

Forensic Issue Forums

While allowing a breadth of competitive opportunities at tournaments is the best solution to specialization, another alternative is to provide forensic forums that focus on issues critical to the entire forensic community. Creating an arena that centers around concerns that unite participants is a way of reducing feelings of competitiveness that increasingly characterize the tournament atmosphere. Forums might be scheduled before awards assemblies or during meal breaks. They can focus on issues ranging from diversity in forensics to graduate and career opportunities for forensic students.

Expand Critic Pools

I don't know of many tournaments that turn critics away. I also don't know of a better way to expose educators to new events than to assign them as critics in those events. While several debate and individual event critics may likely refuse the "opportunity" to judge events in which they have not entered students, such exposure can do wonders to open eyes and build respect. My experiences with placing debate coaches in individual events or individual event coaches in a debate round have almost always been positive. Debaters will utilize their skills in adaptation for their critic. Individual event students will benefit from insights they may not have seen on past ballots. No doubt there will always be the debate and individual participants who view this cross-over as negative. Still, the potential gains to be made from such judge assignments are worth the effort.

Celebrate Our Differences

The final suggestion is one that may be the most difficult to achieve. It may also be the most important step. We must find ways to celebrate the diversity that continues to grow in our community. Alexander (1997) writes "the border between individual events and debate infuses each with alternate ways of knowing and discussing the other. It offers participants a way of understanding both, realizing the potency of logic and the power of performance" (p. 281).

I recently discussed the issue of specialization with a CEDA/NDT colleague who coaches debaters in a competitively successful program that separates its individual event and debate activities. She clearly prefers to be involved with team policy debate. However, she also has training in individual events, respects the time and effort that is necessary to excel in individual events, and praises programs that opt to participate in a variety of events. This attitude of respect for differences can help to maintain bridges between individual events and debate.

While students will make their own ideological choices with regards to forensic opportunities, they can be influenced by their educators. McGee and Simerly (1997) suggest "compassionate specialization," wherein program directors find ways for students to compete in areas outside of a specialized program's events. Such a philosophy can further the notion of inclusion within an environment that might otherwise appear unaccepting of certain forensic opportunities. Additionally, insisting on courtesy toward those who participate in events different from your program, praising student accomplishments across the forensic spectrum, and even allowing opportunities to experience new forensic events can communicate the message that room exists for all under the forensic tent.

Conclusion

The trend toward specialization in the forensic community is difficult to ignore. While a number of rationale exist for this specialization, there are reasons to fear such a trend. Our activity is a laboratory, with the tournament arena serving as a center for much of what is practiced. It follows logically that answers to our community's problems can often be found in the tournament. Adjusting our tournaments so as to allow more broad-based participation and interaction among participants from all forensic events can help our community to realize its potential to teach diverse skills and expose forensic participants to a wide array of communication and argument styles.

Conferences such as this individual events developmental conference are important. But even with the attention it is giving to Lincoln-Douglas and parliamentary debate, its focus is individual events. Our community has much to celebrate, not the least of which is its diverse opportunities. However, we must also be cognizant of the potential expanded choice has to create division. It has been 13 years since a national developmental conference on forensics has been held. With the exception of the bi-annual Pi Kappa Delta developmental conferences that began in 1989, our only opportunity to discuss problems of factionalization have been at bi-annual argumentation conferences, individual event developmental conferences, or on panels at professional meetings. As concerned educators, we must see beyond our "specialty" and look toward the richness of an activity that can and should unite students and educators in a common bond.

Works Cited

Adamo, G. L. (1995). Reform vs. abandonment: Supplemental activities as ways to maintain the integrity of debate. In S. L. Jensen (Ed.), Proceedings From the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference. Lake Charles, LA: Pi Kappa Delta, 110-117.

Alexander, B. (1997). Border crossing or forging gaps?: Pragmatic tensions between supporting individual events and debate. The Southern Journal of Forensics, 1, 276-281.

Bartanen, K. M. (1996). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education, part 2. The Forensic, 882, 1-15.

Bartanen, M. D. (1996). Teaching and Directing Forensics. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Derryberry, B. R. (1991). Forensic preparations and the undergraduate curriculum: Options and strategies for development. In S. Roden, (Ed.). Proceedings to the 1991 Professional Development Conference. Conway, AR: Pi Kappa Delta, 161-174.

Hefling, J. (1997). Intercollegiate tournament calendar. AFA Newsletter, 19, 18-45.

Jensen, S. L. (1993). A survey analysis of regional and national programs and competitive trends in collegiate forensics. The Forensic, 78, 1-10.

Jensen, S. (1996, November). Unifying research and teaching: Pedagogy for the transition from forensics competition to education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Diego, CA.

McGee, B. R. & Simerly, G. (1997). On compassionate specialization. The Southern Journal of Forensics, 1, 282-285.

Parson, D., (Ed.). (1984). American Forensics in Perspective. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Preston, C. T., Jr. (1992, November). Ethical practices and choices in tournament operations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Preston, C. T., Jr. (1997). Principles, participation, and particulars: Choosing activities for forensics programs. The Southern Journal of Forensics, 1, 267-275.

Treadaway, G. (1995). A pedagogical rationale for re-establishing complimentary debate and individual events programs. In S. L. Jensen (Ed.). Proceedings From the Pi Kappa Delta Developmental Conference. Lake Charles, LA: Pi Kappa Delta, 17-24.

West, T. L. (1997). Breadth vs. depth: The tension between debate and individual events in intercollegiate forensics competition. The Southern Journal of Forensics, 1, 261-266.

JUDGE AGREEMENT AND STUDENT ROTATION:
A REAL-LIFE STUDY OF THE
1990 DSR-TKA NATIONAL FORENSICS TOURNAMENT

Vicki L. Karns
Department of Communication & Journalism
Suffolk University, Boston, MA

During the third round of Poetry competition at the 1990 DSR-TKA National Tournament, a student approached the Tab Room and asked why the same people were competing against each other in the first and third rounds. After examining the schematics, it was determined that, indeed, the first and third rounds were identical. At that point in the tournament schedule, it was impossible to reschedule or redo the schematic, so the tournament continued as originally scheduled. Instead of treating this as a crisis, it became an excellent real-life opportunity for research. Thus, this study examines the ranks between Rounds One and Two, Two and Three, and Three and One to see what we can learn about judge agreement and student rotation/scheduling.

BACKGROUND

The scheduling for the 1990 DSR-TKA Tournament was done by the Individual Events Tournament Director prior to arriving at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (the host institution). While all work was supervised, a graduate class in Forensics was utilized for some of the scheduling.[1] There were nine sections of six competitors in Poetry. The scheduling was done on a simple diagonal format:

Round One:

SEC.	A	B	C	D	E	F
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24
	25	26	27	28	29	30
	31	32	33	34	35	36

To schedule Round Two of the event, you shift lines 2-6 one slot to the RIGHT of each preceding line (or you run your diagonal to the left):

Round Two:

SEC.	A	B	C	D	E	F
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	12	7	8	9	10	11
	17	18	13	14	15	16
	22	23	24	19	20	21
	27	28	29	30	25	26
	32	33	34	35	36	31

Finally, to schedule Round Three of the event, you shift lines 2-6 one slot to the LEFT of each preceding line (or you run your diagonal to the right). It is imperative that you use ROUND ONE plots to schedule Rounds Two and Three!

Round Three:

SEC.	A	B	C	D	E	F
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	8	9	10	11	12	7
	15	16	17	18	13	14
	22	23	24	19	20	21
	29	30	25	26	27	28
	36	31	32	33	34	35

---

[1] This diagram is simply for illustration. There were nine sections with 6 speakers in the actual rounds of competition.

Apparently, the person[2] scheduling Round Three of Poetry plotted off Round Two; thus, the round looked like this:

Actual Round Three:

SEC.	A	B	C	D	E	F
	1	2	3	4	5	6
	7	8	9	10	11	12
	13	14	15	16	17	18
	19	20	21	22	23	24
	25	26	27	28	29	30
	31	32	33	34	35	36

Since section order was scrambled when the schematics were typed, no one noticed the similarities. It is ironic that the speaker order was NOT changed; however, so Rounds One and Three were identical on the schematic! It was also curious that only one student noticed the problem. Most of the students who compete in events at DSR-TKA are double-entered, so they rarely hear their entire section of competitors. This particular student was not double-entered, so after the first speaker spoke, she realized she had competed against him in Round One. After the second speaker spoke, she thought it was odd in an event with 9 sections she had competed against that person, too. While waiting for a subsequent competitor to arrive, the student started examining the schematic and discovered the error! There is something inherently sad that none of the other competitors heard enough of their sections to realize they were competing against the same people! It was not surprising that judges did not comment on the problem since no one judged the same person twice.

PROCEDURE

The Tab Room at DSR-TKA used judges' section scoring sheets at the 1990 Tournament. All ballots were checked against these tally sheets, and the tally sheets were then used as the "official" ballots. After the results were recorded, all of the judges' tally sheets were copied. These cumulative ballots were then used to compile the data. First, all ranks for contestants in Rounds One, Two, and Three were recorded by section. Data was then organized and analyzed for judge agreement by round and region. To compare the ranks between rounds, a simple coding system was used. If a student's rank stayed the same, it was coded "S;" if it increased by one rank, it was coded +1; if decreased by one rank, it was coded -1; subsequent increases/decreases in rank were coded appropriately. While differences were recorded and reported, the standards used in Kay and Aden's article "The Relationship of Judging Panel Composition to Scoring at the 1984 N.F.A. Nationals" were used to interpret the data. Finally, a comparison of judge region and agreement in assignment in assigning ranks was conducted.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study of the Poetry competition at DSR-TKA was surprising. The initial expectation was that the results from Rounds One and Three would be very similar. The assumption was that the people who received the ones in Round One would, no doubt, receive them in Round Three. This expectation was not met. The following chart indicates the changes in students' ranks round by round.[3]

Changes in Rank	Rd. ONE to THREE	Rd. ONE to TWO	Rd. TWO to THREE
-4	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	0
-3	2 (4%)	4 (7%)	2 (4%)
-2	4 (7%)	6 (11%)	7 (13%)
-1	11 (20%)	7 (13%)	11 (20%)
S	20 (37%)	15 (28%)	16 (30%)
+1	8 (18%)	3 (6%)	10 (20%)
+2	2 (4%)	14 (27%)	5 (10%)
+3	5 (10%)	2 (4%)	5 (10%)
+4	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	3 (6%)

COMPARISON OF RANKS BY ROUND (Percentages are approximate.)

---

[2] While names of the individuals involved are not necessary for this research, it is important for the integrity of the organization to note that the people who were scheduling the tournament at that time are no longer working in the Tab Room.

[3] DSR-TKA only ranks contestants 1-5, so it was only possible to have a variance of +/-4.

In addition to exploring the differences between ranks in rounds, the data was sorted into two different demographic categories and then compared. As seen in the chart below, the vast majority of the judges in Poetry were from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

SECTION	RD ONE	RD TWO	RD THREE
A	MURRAY	UNL	HIR
B	USD	UAB	BAMA
C	UNL	UNL	UNL
D	UNL	HASTINGS	UNL
E	UNL	HIR	MURRAY
F	HIR(UNL)	HIR	MURRAY
G	UNL	BAMA	HIR
H	UNL	CORNELL	UNL
I	HIR(UNL)	HIR	UNL

JUDGES' SCHOOLS BY ROUND (Some ofthe HIR's were identified as UNL affiliates; other HIR's may also have beat affiliated with UNL, but were not identified.)

Due to the small pool of judges in this event, attempts to create a variety of regions were problematic. So, two different demographic categories created were "regional" (judges from UNL and close geographical location) and "non-regional" (judges from outside the "regional" area). The differences in rank by region are recorded below:

Changes in Rank	REGIONAL JUDGES	NON-REGIONAL JUDGES
-4	2 (2%)	4 (4%)
-3	2 (2%)	5 (5%)
-2	7 (10%)	10 (11%)
-1	17 (25%)	10 (11%)
S	23 (33%)	30 (31%)
+1	9 (14%)	10 (11%)
+2	4 (7%)	20 (20%)
+3	3 (5%)	4 (4%)
+4	2 (2%)	

COMPARISON OF JUDGES' RANKS BY REGION
(Percentages are approximate.)

From a research perspective, statistical significance is necessary to establish a causal link. In their previous study of judge agreement, Kay and Aden used the following definition:

> Judges are considered to be in agreement if they awarded the contestant the same rank or if they differed by only one rank. For example, if one judge gave the student a rank of two and the other gave the student a rank of three, the judges are considered in agreement. When ranks differ by two or more, e.g., one judge ranked the student two and the other ranked the same student four, the case is treated as a disagreement (Kay/Aden, 87).

Their purpose in examining judge agreement was in the context of forensics as a laboratory setting. The idea of "forensics as a laboratory activity" is certainly not a new one. It was an idea which was presented at the first National Developmental Conference on Forensics in 1974. As Kay/Aden[4] state, the value of the experience is dependent upon the quality of the critic-judge evaluation. If the judges give ranks based upon a lack of knowledge or upon some set of subjective/personal biases, the quality of the laboratory experience diminishes. Thus, it is important to study the evaluative process. Clearly, in research designed to look at "quality of judging," judge agreement would indicate a consistency and level of reliability.

By applying this definition, we can see that there was 72% agreement among Regional judges and 53% agreement among Non-Regional judges. While the 72% agreement rate would be considered statistically significant in a social scientific research project, the 53% agreement rate among the Non-Regional judges was below the low agreement rate of 65.22% of all judges in the Kay/Aden study (Kay/Aden, 88). The Kay/Aden study also examined the differences in judge agreement and regional differences. The low rate of 53% agreement among Non-Regional judges was also lower than the 55% agreement rate of regional judges (Kay/Aden, 95). Again, different evaluative standards would seem to account for the low rate of agreement.

---

[4] It be should be noted that in subsequent articles, Aden has suggested we reevaluate our stance on Forensics as a Laboratory experience, see "Reconsidering the laboratory metaphor: Forensics as a liberal *art*," National forensic journal, IX (Fall, 1991), pp. 97-108.

There are several possible explanations for these differences. The majority of the Regional judges were hired judges who were trained by the UNL staff. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the judges were looking for the same criteria and standards. The higher rate of agreement among the Regional judges also suggests that there are regional preferences and expectations. DSR-TKA is also one of the first national tournaments in the season, and it is the first time some people see "out of region" competition. The differences between regional styles and formats is often most apparent when viewed for the first time. If we apply this same standard of agreement to the Comparison of Ranks by round, the notion of regional biases is further strengthened. Agreement between Rounds One and Three was 75%; agreement between Rounds One and Two was 47%; and, agreement between Rounds Two and Three was 70%. Intuitively, since the contestants were identical in Rounds One and Three, a high rate of agreement would be expected. Ironically, it is almost identical to the agreement rates between Rounds Two and Three. Since there was more regional distribution of judges in Round Two than the other two rounds (Round One had two non-regional judges/seven regional; Round Two had five non-regional judges/four regional; Round Three had three non-regional judges/six regional), more judge inconsistency is expected. The expectation is that consistency would exist between Rounds One and Three, but not with Round Two.

There are a couple of possible explanations. First, as previously established, there was a limited pool of judges. With such a small judging pool, one or two judges can make a difference. There were three more non-regional judges in Round Two than in Round One, so regionalism could have had more of an impact. The ratio of regional to non-regional was also closer between Rounds Two and Three, thus the agreement rate was higher. It was also the third round of the tournament. Inexperienced judges had seen several rounds of competition and were more comfortable with the process. Competitors had seen other styles and had the opportunity to adjust performance styles and/or introductions/transitions.

Competitor and judge fatigue might also have had an impact on the agreement rates. Round One took place at 12:30 p.m. on Saturday; Round Two was at 7:45 p.m. The day started at 8:00 a.m. and Round Two was the last round of the day. Round Three was at 10:15 a.m. Sunday morning. It is difficult to determine the impact of a good night's sleep or the lack thereof--whether you are a judge or competitor. Regardless of the explanation, the data strongly supports the existence of regional differences in judging.

One final comparison of the data was made. The ranks of "Same" were evaluated and tabulated. For example, every time a contestant received the same rank from one round to the next, the rank was recorded. This area seems to be where there was the most consistency. One might be quick to assume that there is "universal agreement" on performances which are the least effective; however, there might be another explanation. It is important to remember there were six competitors in each section, and DSR-TKA equalized all ranks to "5." Therefore, there were two ranks of "5" given in each section. In other words, there were twice as many "5's" awarded than any other rank. Clearly, it does not account for all of the agreement, but it does have an impact on the study. (see chart)

RANKS	RD. ONE (20 "S's")	RD. TWO (15 "S's")	RD. THREE (16 "S's")
First	2 (10%)	3 (20%)	2 (12.5%)
Second	1(5%)	1(6%)	2 (12.5%)
Third	5 (25%)	1 (6%)	2 (12.5%)
Fourth	2 (10%)	3 (20%)	2 (12.5%)
Fifth	10 (50%)	7 (48%)	8 (50%)

COMPARISON OF "SAME" RANKS (Percentages are approximate.)

IMPLICATIONS & CONCLUSIONS

This study has provided support for the perception that regional distinctions do exist and do have an impact on judging. It has also been suggested that while diversity in scheduling students in rounds is advantageous, it may not be as important as previously believed. It may not be who you compete against, but by whom you are judged that is significant.

While there are no "universal" guidelines used by tournament directors around the country, there are some general principles most coaches adhere to when scheduling and running a tournament. Students cannot be judged by their own coaches; students should not be judged by the same judge in the same event more than once; students should not compete against the same person more than once in the same event; and, students should not compete against people from their own school. At tournaments where more than one judge is used in preliminary rounds, two judges from the same school should not judge together and two judges should not judge together more them once.

Due to the realities of tournament management, most of the time the only guideline which remains uncompromised is coaches judging their own students. Although, it is not uncommon at smaller tournaments (often in final rounds) to put a coach from each school represented in the round on the panel with a "neutral" (usually defined "hired!") judge or two! Unfortunately, the criterion which may be the most influential, regionalism, is far down the priority list. Even at the national level, very few tournaments have the luxury of imposing regional contraints on ever dwindling judging pools. Superimposing regional contstraints on the judging pools in outrounds does try to address this inequity, but it might be too little too late. As forensic budgets also continue to dwindle, this may have an even greater impact on regional tournaments. It is more cost effective, financially and competitively, to travel a student than a judge.

From a tournament management point of view, the easiest solution would be to insist that schools cover a certain percentage of their entry. It would increase the judge pool (or decrease the size of the tournament!) and increase the choices for scheduling. Instead of mandating a percentage figure, tournament directors could also raise fees to make hiring judges unattractive. This particular approach has been used at several tournaments in connection with debate fees, and has met with very little success. Institutions that can afford to pay do so; those who cannot, just do not show up.

Perhaps more creative solutions are in order. At tournaments where there are small entries (two or three sections), scramble the competitors to use all of your judges. For example, if you have two sections of After Dinner Speaking and Rhetorical Criticism/Communication Analysis, schedule three ADS'ers and three RC/CA'ers in the same section and schedule one judge to listen to them. Most judges appreciate the break from 5 or 6 of the same event and the students sometimes get to hear events they have never heard before. Some tournament directors have also used a "round robin" approach to covering events when judging is tight. Again, it is most effective when you have smaller events, and, again, you mix up the events. Judging panels are created and placed in a room. Students are then assigned to compete in specific rooms with different events. Of course, the disadvantage to these approaches is that students are only competing against 2 other people at a time; however, it does provide diversity in judging!

Ironically, many of the solutions to dealing with regionalism have evolved out of desperation and lack of judges and not a pursuit of higher philosophical and pedagogical ideals! For the truly daring tournament director, instead of rotating your students through the schematic, simply rotate your coaches. Scheduling would be simple and quick and duplication costs would be significantly decreased! Seriously, directors might consider re-evaluating the basic guidelines of tournament decision making. Instead of opting for maximum rotation for students at the expense of your judging pool, the judging pool might become the priority since it seems to be rotation of judges that is most significant!

While the sheer magnitude of attempting to "regulate" judge regionalism at national tournaments would be counter-productive (at many national tournaments, the concept of a stand-by judge is non-existent; tab room personnel are judging in-between tabbing!), we cannot dismiss the issue. Tournament directors might re-evaluate some of their basic assumptions. For example, the rule that prevents two people from judging together more than once might not be as important as providing regional balance. As national tournaments continue to move ever closer toward total computerization, it becomes imperative that our priorities are in order to design the necessary programs.

Finally, as with any problem or concern, education is essential. The production of a "judge training manual" would be an invaluable tool for everyone. This is not a plea for the creation of a "national book of guidelines for training the novice judge." It is a suggestion for the publication of the various guidelines and tools people are using across the country. It is amazing to get tournament results from across country and see the variety of events offered at tournaments. A publication which listed all of the possible events and their descriptions and had copies of training materials coaches use for training at their individual tournaments would be useful in understanding regional differences and helping train coaches for national tournaments.

This real-life situation offered an excellent opportunity to examine some of the basic assumptions of our activity. While this limited study does not presume to mandate we eliminate student rotation and dictate mandatory regional judging, it does suggest we re-examine our priorities about these issues. Change should not be entered into lightly or frivolously; however, without judicial re-examination and evaluation of our activity, we endanger its future!

References

Kay, J. & Aden, R. (1984). The relationship of judging panel composition to scoring at the 1984 NFA nationals. *National forensic journal, 11*, 85-97.

AFA-NIET:
THE CULTURE OF QUALIFYING AND ITS EFFECTS ON FORENSICS

Daniel A. West
Director of Forensics
Rice University, Houston, TX

Background

For those unfamiliar with the qualification procedures for the AFA-NIET, let me offer a brief explanation. The AFA-NIET sponsors competition in eleven different individual events. Students may qualify for the national tournament by earning three "legs" (final round placings) in an event which, when totaled, equal 8 or less. Legs are earned in the following ratio:

2 - 3 contestants (per event)	1 leg
4 - 5 contestants	2 legs
6 - 7 contestants	3 legs
8 - 9 contestants	4 legs
10 - 11 contestants	5 legs
12 or more contestants	6 legs

This system is designed to reward our best competitors with the opportunity to compete at the National Individual Events Tournament.

The Culture of Qualifying

It is my concern that we have created a culture that is primarily focused on qualifying for a national tournament rather than on the pursuit of excellence in performance. This "culture of qualifying" is just like any other culture: it has norms, rules and rituals. It has expected behaviors and offers rewards to those who meet those expectations and punishments to those who don't. When this "culture of qualifying" replaces or supersedes other missions or goals of forensics competition, the following three problems result.

The Problems

1. The Problem of Pulling Slots

In my region, it is quite common for a competitor, once they have qualified for the AFA-NIET, not to compete with that event again until nationals. Countless reasons can be given to justify this practice: it offers other students the opportunity to earn legs; it gives them time to work on their events at home; it gives them a chance to compete in other events. While all of these can be valid reasons for making that decision, we begin to walk a dangerous line when we, as coaches and students, begin to expect competitors to stop competing after they have qualified an event.

When we expect qualified events to be pulled from competition, we begin to view competition with a qualified event as unacceptable. The student competing with the qualified event is, in effect, breaking one of our cultural norms. And if we choose to perpetuate the culture of qualifying it becomes our responsibility to right this wrong and to show them the way. This can happen in any number of ways. We may make a comment on the ballot like, "I thought this was qualified." Or a student might talk to other students about so-and-so from school X who is competing with their qualified Prose. We might wonder with others about their coach's reasons for letting the student compete with a qualified event, or we may actually let the fact that they are competing with a qualified event effect how we rank the round. Regardless of how it happens, if we are expecting them to pull that slot when it has qualified, we have laid the groundwork for an intolerant culture that will not accept behaviors that are outside of the norm.

This intolerance may then spread to similar situations. If our forensic culture is focused on earning qualifying legs for nationals, then it seems fitting that schools that don't attend the AFA-NIET, and therefore aren't going to use those legs, don't deserve them. I have witnessed this first hand. Recently I was working in the tab room at a tournament and we were trying to make a decision as to how many contestants to advance to a final round. There was a clear break of five contestants who had earned a cumulative score of five or less. To bring a sixth competitor into the final, we would have to go to points to figure out which of those students with a rank of seven would advance. The person doing the calculations then made the following statement: "Oh wait. They're from a junior college--they don't go to AFA's. They don't need the leg. Let's just go with five in the final round." I was dumbfounded. It took me a few moments to gather my wits and voice my concern about this attitude. Ultimately, six students were advanced to the final round, but this comment still scares me. The belief that qualified slots should be pulled fosters the attitude that earning AFA-NIET qualification is the ultimate reason for competing and perpetuates intolerance of non-AFA programs.

2. *The Problem of "Looking for Legs"*

Looking at the AFA Tournament Calendar, it is apparent that "swing" tournaments have become quite popular throughout the country. In speaking to coaches from Texas who were around when the "swings" were first introduced, it is clear that they were invented to cope with the great distances some schools needed to travel in order to attend tournaments. Since many schools had to travel between eight and fourteen hours to get to their closest contest, it only made sense to have two tournaments once you got there, thus giving students the opportunity to compete twice without having to travel every weekend. While this may have been the case in the past, I contend that this justification is no longer true. I will argue that most schools attend swing tournaments for the sole purpose of earning qualifying legs. In Texas, during Fall semester, it is possible for me to attend fourteen tournaments in eight weeks, all without driving more that four hours from Houston. While you might think that this is due, in part, to location, most schools in attendance at these tournaments have had similarly short drives. With so many tournaments available, students and coaches no longer see tournaments as an opportunity to perform at their best, but as places to earn the legs necessary for qualification. When this happens, tournaments are no longer laboratories for students to practice their craft and perfect their performances. Instead, they become academic games, reducing the qualification process to little more than hoop-jumping for our students where they must struggle to piece together the right combination of legs through strategy and patience.

This hoop-jumping further takes our focus away from the pursuit of excellence by encouraging our students to set their goals on specific legs, and not on the overall quality of their performance. I know that I am not alone in perpetuating this problem. This past Spring, a student of mine was having some difficulty qualifying his persuasive speech for nationals. All he needed was a third place leg to qualify and I remember saying to him, "Just go out there and get the three, and then we'll work on it." It was only later that I realized the implications of that statement. What was I trying to accomplish by telling my student to aim for third place? Did I want him to think I viewed him as incapable of actually winning a tournament? Did I want him to feel that he wasn't worth my time because he hadn't qualified yet? Because I was trapped in the quest for legs, I lost sight of why he was competing in the first place. He was trying to perfect his craft and to learn how to give increasingly better and better performances. And our quest for legs was getting in the way.

3. *The Lack of Competition Problem*

Last year I had a very talented student on my team who qualified three events for the AFA-NIET before the end of September. Being the good coach that I thought I was, I advised the student to pull those events from most competitions, so that other students on our team and from other schools could earn their legs for nationals. At nationals I noticed that something was missing from that student's performance, that she didn't have the same spark of intensity I had seen before, that she didn't shine.

I had thought that pulling this student's events from competition would ultimately help her and the other students on my team, but the reality was that I actually hurt everyone. By pulling her qualified slots from competition, I robbed her of the opportunity to perfect her craft and to work toward a performance that would propel her audience into the sublime. I have often heard and made the argument that this can be done just as well in practice as it can be at a tournament. But my experience has proven me wrong.

This problem is even more apparent when we draw an analogy between intercollegiate forensics and track and field. In order to qualify for nationals in track, a competitor must run his/her event underneath the qualifying time set by the NCAA at any one of the qualifying tournaments throughout the year. Just because a student achieves this at the first tournament does not mean that the coach pulls him/her from competition for the rest of the season, or that other coaches expects that student not to compete. On the contrary, that student will continue to practice that event not only at home, but in competition, perfecting his/her skill, hoping to run faster each time, preparing him/her to run on any type of track against different competitors and under a variety of conditions.

This is where the "culture of qualifying" once again cheats our students. By expecting competitors to stop competing once they have qualified for nationals, we are sending the message that qualifying is the goal, while perfecting their performance has little place in regular season tournaments. In essence, we are saying to them, "once you have qualified, there is nothing more I can teach you and nothing more you can learn from your fellow competitors." And this, as we know, could not be farther from the truth. I have been in forensics for nineteen years, which is more that half of my life, and I am still learning from the performances I watch at each tournament I attend. Whey then is it so hard for us to send our qualified students back into competition? Do we really think that they have nothing to learn? Or have we become so wrapped up in sending as many slots to nationals as possible that we want those competitors "out of the way"?

The attitude of getting qualified students out of the way only carries the lack of competition problem to another level. For years I have told my students to watch final rounds to figure out how to do an event, or more importantly, to figure out why they are not there. But the effect of the culture of qualifying on the quality of performance became clear to me this Spring when I realized that most of what I was seeing in final rounds, and most of what my students were doing, was just not good. The students who gave quality performances were already out of the way.

The question, "Would you want your Dean to see this?" has been asked of CEDA debate for years, pointing to the fact that if viewed, most administrators would most likely eliminate funding for their debate programs because of the unintelligibility of the performances. If we are not careful, the same thing could happen to individual events. This spring, I had a student who had not qualified for nationals even after our district tournament. So, the week after districts we attended a local Nationals Warm Up Swing, in reality nothing more than two "last-chance-for-legs" tournaments. My student ended up being top speaker at both tournaments and qualified two events for the AFA-NIET. But at what cost? He was embarrassed to be top speaker at the last-chance tournament. He was not proud of his performances and he knew they were not of the caliber of other students on his own team who had qualified earlier in the year. He realized that he had qualified for nationals because he was the best of what was left. And I had to ask myself, what kind of message was that sending him? Why would any one

of us want our students to walk away from a performance of which they could not be proud? I had taught him how to qualify for nationals, but I had not taught him how to perform.

Solutions

The solutions to these problems have nothing to do with the qualifying system for the AFA-NIET or any other national tournament. It is far more difficult that that. If we continue to perpetuate the culture of qualifying, I fear that we will ultimately doom individual events competition to nothing more than an exercise in mediocrity. If we truly believe that the goal of competition is to help our students perfect the craft of performance, we have to change our attitudes about qualifying for the AFA-NIET. We have to allow ourselves to forget about legs at tournaments. We have to quit asking each other, "how many slots do you have for nationals?" We must stop announcing how may AFA qualifying legs there were in each event at awards. And, most importantly, we must change our attitudes about competing with qualified slots. By no means am I advocating that a student compete with all their events at every tournament throughout the year. What we must do is consider factors besides qualification when deciding what events a student should compete in each week. If my students who have qualified still have something to learn from you as a judge, or from your students' performances, then I owe them the opportunity to go back into competition. We, as judges, owe it to our students to listen to their performances objectively and to help them to polish their skills and perfect their craft. And competitors owe it to themselves to seek ways they can learn from each others' performances, qualified or not.

All of this fails, however, if we allow one comment like, "Why are they competing in Impromptu? I thought they were qualified," to go unchallenged. We must demand tolerance for competitive choices from ourselves and from our students. It is only when we shift the focus at tournaments away from qualifying and toward excellence in performance, that we can truly move our discipline forward and be proud of the work that we do.

TEACHING AND COACHING INDIVIDUALS: THE USE OF LEARNING STYLES IN FORENSICS COACHING

Thomas Bartl
Southwest State University, Marshall, MN

When I ask myself how to approach the issue of training coaches in competitive speech and debate, I find myself posing a different question. It seems that before I can ascertain what could or should be done to train coaches effectively or to train effective coaches I need to know what it is these coaches are expected to do. The answer to this question must then determine what kind of training would be appropriate.

There are many approaches one could take when trying to define the function of the forensics coach. Many things are required of the successful and "good" coach. An intimate knowledge of the activity and its requirements, motivational skills and administrative skills are just a few of these and all ought to be included in the training of coaches. However, I find myself coming back to one aspect that often seems to be ignored, possibly because it is so much a part of our image of a forensics coach that we see no need to state it explicitly. The forensics coach is a teacher.

Forensics is an educational activity and one of the reasons why we hold it in such high esteem is our knowledge that students can gain more from this activity than competitive success and "hardware." This is not to say that these are not important aspects; competition is an integral part of the activity. But when I ask myself what can be gained from participation in Forensics, my immediate answers include such things as the ability to interpret literature, critical thinking, learning when to follow the rules and when to bend them a little, research skills, organizational skills, accepting victory or defeat gracefully. Clearly, this is not a comprehensive list, but it does show that what forensics can teach goes far beyond the realm of speech and debate.

What does this mean for the training of coaches? It appears that it means that we have to recognize the great opportunity we have to teach. If we look at the time we spend with competitors in small groups or one-on-one situations, and then consider how often we wish we could do more of that with the students in the classes that we teach, we can clearly recognize the opportunities. In order to take advantage of these, we have to see ourselves as teachers as well as coaches. Thus, the training of coaches should include teaching methods and ways to use these methods while coaching.

Most coaches are active in the classroom and know what works for them there and what does not. Many "coaches in training" are also teaching assistants who are trying to find that out. Classes, journal articles, and panels at conventions, among other things, expose us to new developments in teaching, show us new techniques or lead us back to old ones that have been found to be effective after all. Thus, we continually try to improve our classroom teaching by trying new things and keeping abreast of new developments.

It seems to me that for the forensics coach the next step should be to take these new ideas and find ways to incorporate them in our coaching. Quite often we might find new ways to teach our competitors, ways that benefit them competitively as well as in other areas.

I have tried to take the concept of learning styles and find aspects that might be useful for the forensics coach and competitor. I will briefly explain what the concept entails and then make some suggestions as to how it could be incorporated into forensics coaching.

Learning style has been defined as a biologically and developmentally imposed set of personal characteristics that make the same teaching method effective for some and ineffective for others. Everyone has an individual learning style, and thus instruction and teaching methods may be adapted toward these individual styles. There are various models describing learning styles using varying nomenclature. However, all models acknowledge the uniqueness of every learner.

Because there are various models there are also various tools to discover one's personal preferences. One of the most widely respected is that developed by Rita and Kenneth Dunn. Their "Productivity Environmental Preference Survey" is used to determine the learning styles of students in various aspects, including the environment, emotional, psychological and sociological aspects, and physical preferences. Based on the answers to the survey-questions, a scale is created that tells us under what conditions the student learns most effectively. These conditions include such things as bright or dim light, cool or warm temperatures, and the time of day. Additionally, it gives us information whether the student learns best alone or with others, whether auditory or visual learning is most effective, and if the student wants a high or low level of structure. This information can then be used by the student to introduce into their learning environment those elements that may have been missing before. It can also be used by the teacher to structure assignments and activities so that they may be completed successfully.

For the forensics coach this information could be very helpful. Let us assume that at the beginning of a student's forensics career we have them complete one such survey. This may be the first time that the student has done this and so many of the results may come as a surprise to the student. Not only will we be able to adapt some of our coaching but the student may very well be able to use the results in other classes. Effective learning takes less time than ineffective learning, and thus we might be blessed with a student who can use time more effectively, and thus spend more time on Forensics. We all know that students have many other things to do; if we can help them do these other things more effectively, the result may be students who are not quite as "stressed" as they often are. More than just giving us students who are more effective learners in general, however, the results of the survey can be used to design coaching more individually.

One example is the pesky problem of memorization. As we all know many students have trouble memorizing their speeches or pieces. In this case, the determination whether someone is a visual or auditory learner can be extremely helpful. A lot of time and frustration may be saved by providing students who are auditory learners with a tape of their speech that they may use to memorize it. On the other hand, for visual learners a clean, clearly legible copy may be the answer.

For those in Extemporaneous Speaking this may be another indication that watching television or listening to the radio is not useless. While it may be harder to file, the information learned from these sources is valuable and may be easier to access for the auditory learner.

The determination at what time of the day a student functions best may lead us to make appointments for that time of day, if possible. This may save us the frustration of having very unproductive sessions during the morning with those of us who work better during the afternoon.

Those students who prefer a structured approach to learning may benefit from clear assignments given to them during the process of speechwriting. Giving deadlines for such things as outlines, research, and a first draft may be something that we are hesitant to do, but for those students who want a great deal of structure in their process it may be just what is needed to assure successful completion of the project.

Many more possibilities exist. For some it may be effective to have coaching sessions with other students in the room. Some may want to make visual representations of their speeches to aid them in the composition process. Some may want to work very hard on one event for a short amount of time, and then leave it alone for a while. Some may want to write their debate cases in the squad room while others may need to be alone in a clean space.

As can be seen, learning styles can be a highly valuable tool for the Forensics coach and for the competitor. Learning styles have been used successfully in many educational settings and can easily work for us. As we adapt our coaching and learning to the individual styles of the students we can use our time more effectively, and goals may be achieved more easily.

Learning styles are only one example of an educational concept that can easily be adapted to the special needs of the Forensics world. As coaches we have a great opportunity to work with students in close contact, to spend much time with them. Whatever else we do, it is important that we consider ourselves teachers during much of that time and use those techniques and ideas that will let us fulfill that role more fully. When training coaches we cannot forget this either. There are many things a Forensics coach needs to know and to learn, and one of the most important ones is to know how to use the most effective ways of teaching our students while coaching.

Abstract: An important link has been made in current research between coach burnout and improper training of directors of forensics. Although the structure for such training is in place via the graduate programs of universities offering forensics, this arena has been underutilized. A competency-based model of training is presented utilizing both curricular and non-curricular methods. Six competency areas are established, with a call for national standards toward the development of future coaches by those programs with graduate assistantships in forensics.

SOLVING FOR A HEALTHY FUTURE: CREATING NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR TRAINING FUTURE DIRECTORS OF FORENSICS

Thomas A. Workman
Director of Forensics
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE

Most coaches of collegiate oratory teach their students that all problems have a cause, and that once the cause is fully determined, a set of solutions can be created and set into action that should eventually solve the problem. Though labeling the current trends in the careers of our nation's forensics directors as problematic may be an overstatement, a number of articles, papers and presentations have called our attention to the growing concern of career burnout, program reduction and/or elimination, and the declining health of the activity for coaches and directors (Burnett and Danielson, 1992; Bartanen, 1996; Jensen, 1996). Bartanen's 1996 report of a national survey sponsored by the Guild of American Forensic Educators notes that well over half of the respondents did not expect their careers to continue beyond five years, with nearly two-thirds of respondents stating that they would be leaving the activity by the end of the century (p. 17).

Many causes for this problem have been explored, yet substantial evidence exists correlating the decline of long-term careers in forensics education to improper or non-existent training of those pursuing such a career (Bartanen, 1996; Burnett and Danielson, 1992; Gill, 1990; Hassencahl, 1993; Jensen, 1993). Jensen (1996) goes as far as to state, "With evidence pointing toward limited careers in forensic coaching and poor training for those entering the forensics profession, we can see the tenuous foundation for forensic education. Our activity is only as strong as the training of the professionals that teach it" (p. 2). One notion is that, as untrained or poorly trained coaches begin their positions, they are not fully equipped to handle the sheer magnitude of tasks that require a wide array of skills--from bookkeeping to public relations. Their training and experience in public speaking, oral interpretation, debate and even competition is undermined by the day-to-day operations of a program. Moreover, they may be approaching these tasks in ineffective and non-efficient ways, creating more stress and hence a higher probability of burnout. Training cannot remove the stresses that surround a director's work, but it can better prepare the coach for those stresses and enskill the coach to work more productively and efficiently.

With such a clear-cut cause, one solution to the growing problem of coach and program burn-out seems to be better education for the future forensics educator. Yet very little has been written on the subject, with only a handful of models presented (Bartanen, 1996; Hassencahl, 1993; Larson-Casselton, 1991). We as a community are just beginning to realize our need for formal training in forensics administration and education; it's no surprise that we've not yet begun to build the road.

Luckily, the basic structure for such training currently exists in the graduate programs and assistantships offered at universities across the country. Historically, a student wishing to pursue a career in forensics education begins such work as a graduate assistant with a speech team while enrolled in a masters program in Communication Studies. Yet,. sadly, Bartanen (1996) reports that less than half of all universities with graduate programs have a course in forensics direction and administration, and Hassencahl (1993) paints an even bleaker picture for doctoral students, despite consistent findings that such a course can prove to be a key foundation to formal instruction in forensics education (Jensen, 1996; Leland, 1996; Workman, 1996). Without curriculum, training is received through experience, which, though meritorious (Leland, 1996), leaves training as widely disparate and unstructured (Jensen, 1996). Clearly, the graduate program, and the Ph.D. program in particular, serves as the perfect place for such professional training, as it can provide both curricular and experiential training for the future coach, similar to an apprenticeship for any established profession. Hassencahl (1993) remarks that only six Ph.D. programs offer coursework in forensics (p.2), yet perhaps it is not the number of programs offering on-the-job training as the quality of training these programs provide, and more importantly, the utilization of these programs by those wishing to pursue a career in forensics education. Without a clear sense of what such training entails, or national standards for such training, the road to careers in forensics education remains no more than a dirt path, and one that few even realize they must travel.

Clearly, it's time to begin building the road. This paper is an attempt to create a foundation for both curricular and non-curricular training for graduate students wishing to become directors of forensics. I first review the literature concerning skills and tasks of the director/coach. Next, I present six competency areas that I believe need to serve as the core of all graduate training in forensics education if we are to create better developed, stronger, and longer-lasting directors of forensics. I then present several curricular and non-curricular approaches to achieving competency in the six areas, establishing that both arenas are necessary for the development of future forensics educators. Finally, I argue for national standards for developing future coaches and administrators in forensics, so that, despite the individual differences of any particular program, a future coach from any university can receive consistent instruction and development.

The Skills of a Director/Coach: Current Research

Several approaches have been taken to better understand the skills and tasks of the coach/director of forensics. Bartanen (1996), in one of the few-textbooks currently serving those training in forensics administration, writes that "Individuals who teach and coach forensics must be dedicated, 'jack-of-all-trade' teachers" (p. xiii). In reality, however, they need to be jack of more trades than simply teaching. Danielson and Hollwitz (1993) created a job-analysis approach for the evaluation of coaches, and in doing so, produced a comprehensive list of job-specific skills that serve our purpose here. Through a survey of current directors, they determined dimensions, tasks and worker characteristics associated with performing the functions of the director. These dimensions go far beyond the standard areas of public speaking, debate or oral interpretation instruction, and include accounting and bookkeeping, administering the speech/debate program, arranging student participation in off-campus tournaments, coaching speech/debate participants, and recruiting students for the speech/debate program. Lesser tasks include public relations, coordinating college/university and community service, and tournament hosting (pg. 17). It is interesting to note that only two of these dimensions--coaching speech/debate students and program administration--were commonly listed in the survey of forensic position advertisements conducted by Shelton in 1996.

Another area of skill lies in guidance and counseling. Colvert (1993) found that coaches across the country were involved in at least some degree of personal counseling with undergraduate students for everything from relationship issues and career decisions to substance abuse and eating disorders. Though clear lines must be drawn around the boundaries of ethical and appropriate personal counseling, the evidence suggests that the relationship between a coach and the students will involve this level of interpersonal interaction.

Along the same lines, however, are the skills needed to work with the gifted and talented, many of whom find a home in our forensics programs. Little is mentioned about this type of student in the majority of the literature, yet it is imperative that a new coach recognize the needs, issues, and approaches to the exceptionally bright or talented student. Beyond developing coaching styles for a student who may out-read, out-perform, and out-do the director in accomplishments, new coaches must be able to work with what are often highly sensitive and often difficult temperaments that can, without proper training, exasperate the best coach or director. Leadership skills are critical here, as a director must be able to take a variety of personalities and personal issues and create a collective team effort, not simply for the sake of team trophies but for the educational goal of helping talented people work with others.

Anecdotally, the list of tasks and skills could be endless. From handling medical emergencies on the road to helping a new competitor overcome stagefright, the specific skills and duties of a forensics director are as unique as the many programs existing across the country. Yet, the goal of this paper is to focus on those key skill areas that can and should be included in a training program, allowing a graduate student to develop mastery before entering the field as a full-fledged director.

Six Competency Areas for Forensics Directors

Therefore, in order to establish national standards for training, a specific set of competencies must be created to serve as goals for the trainer. From the literature mentioned earlier and the many anecdotes of coaches across the country, six key areas of competency emerge. Each area heading is followed by a set of skills that would demonstrate competency in the area.

1. *Instructional Competency:* The ability to teach undergraduate students in an interpersonal or small group structure.

    a. Demonstrates a general knowledge of speech communication theories and practices.
    b. Demonstrates a general knowledge of coaching styles and methods.
    c. Demonstrates specific expertise in an area of speech performance or competition.
    d. Demonstrates a knowledge of educational styles, needs and issues.
    e. Demonstrates the ability to assess student ability and needs.
    f. Demonstrates the ability to adapt teaching/coaching style and method to the learning style and needs of the student.
    g. Demonstrates the ability to evaluate student progress and adjust goals and methods when necessary.

2. *Financial Management Competency:* The ability to manage financial records and operations.

    a. Demonstrates the ability to create a budget.
    b. Demonstrates the ability to manage funds used for operations.
    c. Demonstrates the ability to comprehend financial statements.
    d. Demonstrates the ability to solve financial problems.
    e. Demonstrates the ability to communicate financial issues to others.
    f. Demonstrates the ability to raise funds.

3. *Leadership & Responsibility Competency:* The ability to motivate, guide, and take charge of others.

    a. Demonstrates the ability to problem-solve.
    b. Demonstrates the ability to motivate others.
    c. Demonstrates the ability to work within departmental policy limitations.
    d. Demonstrates the ability to maintain professionalism.
    e. Demonstrates the ability to handle crisis.
    f. Demonstrates the ability to establish leadership over a group.
    g. Demonstrates the ability to maintain safety for the group.

4. *Administrative Competency:* The ability to administrate tasks and projects.

    a. Demonstrates the ability to organize tasks and projects.
    b. Demonstrates the ability to manage multiple and simultaneous projects.
    c. Demonstrates the ability to interact with and influence others.
    d. Demonstrates the ability to establish priorities.
    e. Demonstrates the ability to manage paperwork.
    f. Demonstrates the ability to work within deadlines.
    g. Demonstrates a general understanding of administrative procedures.
    h. Demonstrates the ability to work with administrative technology.

5. *Interpersonal Competency:* The ability to communicate effectively in interpersonal settings.

    a. Demonstrates the ability to adapt styles of listening to the needs of others.
    b. Demonstrates the ability to provide empathy.
    c. Demonstrates a general knowledge of resources for student issues and problems.
    d. Demonstrates the ability to express themselves clearly in interpersonal settings.
    e. Demonstrates the ability to create functional relationships.
    f. Demonstrates the ability to create professional relationships.
    g. Demonstrates the ability to use referrals effectively.

6. *Professional Competency:* The ability to establish and maintain professionalism in the field.
    a. Demonstrates a formulated philosophy of speech performance and program administration.
    b. Demonstrates a general knowledge of competitive rules, approaches, and practices in a variety of competitive arenas.
    c. Demonstrates an ability to evaluate performances in competition.
    d. Demonstrates an ability to write educational critiques.
    e. Demonstrates an interest in scholarly activities of the field.
    f. Demonstrates an interest in continued development.

Training Methods and Approaches

In an attempt to address the many needs of training future coaches, the National Developmental Conference on Forensics set forth recommendations for a degree program in forensics, involving coursework in speech communication and supervised experience with directing a forensics program (McBath, 1975). Proponents exist for both curricular instruction and supervised experience. Jensen (1996) writes, "The ideal directing forensics course, aside from integrating the knowledge gained in other coursework, (1) provides activities that reflect the integral dimensions of directing a forensic program, (2) allows for interaction regarding concerns of the students in the course, as well as the choices that face them as forensics educators, and (3) culminates in the student understanding the importance of having a philosophy of forensics and being able to communicate that vision" (p. 7). Leland (1996) states, "Instruction can be as simple as following basic directions on how to complete paperwork, to discussing deeper issues of balancing competition and educational missions of the program" (p. 9). He adds, later, "It is essential that graduate students get a chance to learn by being involved in the actual day-to-day and weekend to weekend activities of the team and the leadership" (p. 11).

Obviously, in order for competencies to be reached, both coursework and guided experience will be essential components of a training program. An endless number of models exist under the structure of the graduate assistantship which serve perfectly for training, whether reporting occurs individually or within a small group, as teams of GTAs or alongside the Director. Both formal and informal approaches should be developed, where a graduate student has both course requirements for the accomplishment of competencies as well as gains competency from individual mentorship. Carver & Larson-Casselton (1990) found that such mentoring relationships do exist within the community and, despite differences in the interpretation of the term, produced an important contribution to the education of new coaches.

Serving as the trainer would most likely be the Director of Forensics, who is the person most likely to teach the Directing Forensics course and to whom the graduate assistants in forensics most often report. This is often the person who provides an evaluation of the graduate assistant for decisions regarding future funding, and the one who will most likely provide the letter of recommendation for future employment in the activity. Obviously, such a person must be able to demonstrate competencies in all six areas, but moreover, must be able to commit significant time and resources to the training of future coaches as a part of their departmental and professional duties. It is absurd to believe that a Director of Forensics can pay as much attention to the competitive needs of the program as they can to the training of future coaches without the provision of resources by the department, whether that includes an assistant director to administer the daily tasks of maintaining a competitive standing or whether it simply involves defining a position that allows time for and places a value on the training of graduate students as part of their educational mission. It is my guess that few university departments have made this level of commitment, yet in order for coaches to be well trained, we must begin building the training facilities--many of whom already exist and are ready to produce competent coaches with several minor adjustments in curriculum, line redressment, and promotion.

A Call for National Standards

We all know that, when detailing elaborate solutions, talk is cheap and actions speak louder than words. Producing better coaches through better training will require support from national forensic organizations, university department administrators, and individual coaches who serve as the important recruiting officers for the new army of undergraduate competitors who will consider a career in coaching. By adopting these or similar competencies into national standards for training, national forensics associations can serve a vital role in paving the road to better coaches without becoming involved in prescribing or demanding curriculum from university programs. A statement of national standards for director/coach training would, in fact, legitimize the activities of many university programs striving to provide excellent training to their graduate students, and provide consistency in the scope of training offered across the nation.

There is certainly more to study, to discuss, and to explore in this area. Competencies must be thoroughly tested to be proven valid indications of success, and training methods must be explored and communicated to those who are attempting to raise the next crop of coaches. Yet, our discussions must not override initial action, or the laying of a foundation to get the work started. As Jensen (1996) so aptly warns us,

> ". . . we can ill-afford to place our programs in the hands of poorly trained educators. To do so is not fair to our institutions, to the educators faced with making choices they are not prepared to make, nor to the students who are directly impacted by the abilities of their teachers. Most importantly, it is not fair, nor is it healthy for our activity" (p. 12).

The first step is to declare a standard that serves as a map for those traveling. The construction of this road may take time, but the results are well worth the effort.

References

Bartanen, M. D. (1996). Teaching and directing forensics. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarlsbrick.

Bartanen, K. M. (1996). A preliminary assessment of the professional climate of forensic education, Part I. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 81, 1-21.

Burnett Pettus, A., & Danielson, M. A. (1992). Analysis of forensics program administration: What will the 1990's bring? National Forensic Journal, X, 11-18.

Abstract: The author will present her personal and frank ideas of what she sees as a dangerous trend in public speaking events. A loose analogy of forensics to a swinging pendulum will first be explained. Then the author will explain what she sees as the current state of public speaking events, and finally, an attempt to predict some outcomes for the future of public speaking events and some suggestions for our consideration. The aim of this paper is to make us think: where are we in this quest for excellence in public speaking events? How did we get to where we are and where do we go from here?

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING: THE PERFECT PENDULUM SWINGS

M'Liss S. Hindman
Speech Instructor and Director of Forensics
Tyler Junior College, Tyler, TX

Forensics has been an overpowering part of my life for over thirty years--twenty-three of those as a coach. Even though I have not quite reached the mid-forties, one of my colleagues in Texas last year announced that he and some other younger coaches had determined that I was the reigning Grandmother of Texas forensics. Why or how did they determine that title? Amidst the current, active coaches in this state, I have coached at the college level for the longest amount of time. Did this revelation make me feel old? No, it just made me feel weird; because I still internally see myself as about 28 years old, still out to conquer the world and "slay the dragons," etc. What does my personal longevity have to do with this panel's topic of New Directions for Public Speaking? Well, I hope that it gives me a bit of credibility to discuss what I see as a dangerous trend in this wonderful art of public speaking. Mostly today I intend to share my observations and my gut instincts honed from these thirty odd years in the business of competitive speaking events. First, I will present a loose analogy of forensics to a pendulum swinging. Next, I will explain what I see as the current state of public speaking events, the bright, beautiful spots, as well as the warty areas. Finally, I will attempt bravery and predict some outcomes for the future of public speaking events and some measures that we should possibly consider. The aim of this paper is to make us all think about where are we in this quest for excellence in public speaking events? How did we get to where we are and where in the heck do we go from here?

Most of us have heard the analogy of either various things in life or life itself to a swinging pendulum. For instance fashion trends. What is trendy in fashion today was in fashion back in the late 60s and early 70s. The pendulum has swung back to where it was before--for better or worse, depending on your prospective of bell bottoms or wide legged pants and nylon shirts and blouses. It is my belief that our field of forensics can loosely be identified with the pendulum theory: to the far left is mediocrity and to the far right is excellence. I believe we are currently at the apex of the pendulum's right swing and that it is about to come crashing back to left to the doldrums of mediocrity if we as educators in the world of forensics do not come up with tactics of how to perpetuate the pursuit of excellence once again.

For the vast majority of my professional life, I have seen forensics grow and improve. Speakers became more fluent, wittier, and have developed a lively sense of ease and naturalness in delivery. Topics improved greatly over the years together with the vast majority of speakers choosing topics of depth and significance. I have been fascinated as school program after school program began to turn out accomplished orators. Regularly, my comments to my colleagues of "I just judged the best round of Persuasion (or whatever the event) that I've ever heard" became embarrassingly redundant. During the last five years or so I found that I began to expect every round of competition to be near *perfect*. I expected every student to know not only the basic skills of orators such as: how to stand up front in the middle of the room, to have an introduction with a preview, to develop 2-4 points, and to have a conclusion which summarizes the main ideas; but also to know and practice the finer skills of public speaking: how to make eye contact effectively with every person in the room, to include witty comments even within a relatively dry topic, to use movement and gestures effectively, etc. And obviously I was not alone in my expectations.

I have had dozens of conversations with colleagues who made statements that they clearly were expecting near perfection as well. And I have read dozens of ballots--and you have as well, I am sure--from our colleagues who were almost bitter when they judged one of our students who did not fit this image of a perfect orator. Comments like "your speech topic has possibilities, but you have a long way to go before it is effectively developed" or worse "your topic has potential and perhaps you do, too. Work more on your organization, your delivery and your sense of significance before the next competition." What is worse still, I admit that I have prevented my own students from going to tournaments by telling them that their speech was not quite ready yet, when what I really meant was I didn't think they were ready for the wolftrap of forensic competition where, by the luck or fate of the draw, your student may fall victim to the pen of the super sleuth of oration--the judge on your circuit who will list every single mistake that the student may make and will never include any words of encouragement. By my own actions, I was tolerating this perfection craze. We are guilty of defining perfection too narrowly.

Now, please don't get the wrong impression. No one in this room or at this conference loves forensics any more than I do. And I will admit that I am as competitive as the rest of you. I also strongly believe in the pursuit of perfection. I believe strongly in what we do as forensic educators. I feel that one of our principal aims as forensic educators should be to help students strive for perfection--to become the very best orator that he or she can become. I even dare to repeat what my sports competition crazy husband's favorite quotation is by Vince Lombardi, the legendary Green Bay Packer coach of old:

> "We must strive for perfection. In striving for perfection, we may never attain it, but in the pursuit of perfection we will attain excellence."

That's not a bad motivational motto for any of us--in any of our endeavors--but here is where I feel we have gone wrong in public speaking events. In our pursuit of what be have grown to accept as being "perfection," we have become convinced that there is only one way of doing events correctly. Instead of setting up general models by which we can show our students what a good speech is or what effective delivery is, we have created a cookie mold by which we seek to stamp out nearly identical speakers. Oh sure, there are differences in our speakers - just as there are differences between any two cookies in a batch. One may have a few more chocolate chips, one may be plump, while the other is flat, but the taste . . . is identical. And our tournaments have become giant cookie factories where we present our current batch for examination and approval, hoping that few or none will be rejected to the crumb heap.

Now, don't take my cynical analogy the wrong way. I am all for competition. I value competitive forensics. After all, creating opportunities for students to showcase their abilities in a tournament setting is much of what forensic activity is all about. Tournaments can be a great motivational factor to encourage our students to work. The danger is that we have let the tournament setting become *"the end"* and *"defining setting"* and we are forgetting about the real world applications of forensics--the skills that our students can use every day of their lives, long after all of their national eligibility is used. And one of the severest dangers in the quest for perfect orators is that many of our colleagues have succumbed to the temptation of writing the speeches for their students. "After all," they probably reason, "I have a hard enough time preparing the student in all of the intricacies of perfect delivery--I don't also have time to teach them how to find a topic, how to research a topic, and how to write it before competition starts in September." And yes, come on, admit it. Don't we expect to see cookie cutter perfect little speeches in the earliest of tournaments? I remember, not so many years ago, that we were into the spring semester before the majority of students had their speeches totally memorized--many used some notes or had to stumble through several memory glitches. During the past few years, we, as coaches and judges, have grown to expect perfectly memorized speeches by the end of September! And after we critique a speech one weekend and suggest major changes in its development, if by some quirk of fate we are selected to judge that student during the very next weekend's tournament, we expect to see that student with the completely revamped speech, completely re-memorized. I admit it. I have asked this impossible task of some of my own students before. Are we for real? Who has that much time--even if they didn't have classes, a job, and other responsibilities besides forensics?

This quest for perfection in all elements of public speaking has gotten out of hand in my opinion. Even in the lower preparation speaking events, we read snide comments on ballots about students who don't have at least five documented quotations in Extemporaneous Speaking and at least two esoteric examples in Impromptu. Get real. For the majority of beginning college speech students, it is an accomplishment to deliver an Extemporaneous or Impromptu speech with clear organization and no notes. Why are we insistent on all of the other perfection trappings for each and every competitor? I shudder to remember that within the past five years, I have discouraged students from entering those events, because I knew that they did not have the academic background to furnish them with the esoteric examples or I didn't have the funds to furnish their files with the impressive journals and magazines. By the way, whatever happened to the credibility of Time, Newsweek, and U. S. News and World Report any way? Why aren't they "good enough" sources any more?

Bottom line, our *current narrow definition of "perfection"* has resulted in two calamities: (1) the "sameness" of forensic orators. Speakers using the same basic organizational patterns, the same triangle shaped walking pattern, the same genuine smile, the same type of medical or technological topics. The second (2) calamity is that we have discouraged too many students and perhaps too many programs from even attempting to compete. My "slap" to the face reality came while sitting in a business meeting of one of the six forensic organizations I belong. One of my colleagues, who we would probably identify as "not-very-serious about the activity" because she only travels her squad to one or two tournaments a semester, stood up in the meeting and berated us for treating her students so rudely and unprofessionally. How had we behaved? By writing such comments as: "not a competitive topic," "you're not using a winning format," or "this topic will never go anywhere."

At first, I admit, I just hung my head a bit and thought, "yes, those are tacky comments to make, but we are trying to make our students the best that they can be." I rationalized, "We are just trying to educate these students to try harder, to strive for perfection." But several weeks later, I woke up to the reality. We have made *competitive forensics* into an *elitist sport*. By writing those sorts of comments we had essentially told that student, "You are not good enough to play in our ballpark. Go home." By rewarding sameness--the students who best fit the perfect cookie mold for how a speech should be done--we have discouraged hundreds of students who sadly come to the realization that they will never attain that level of perfection.

I am still not advocating doing away with competition. I am advocating that we take a long hard look at our standards of excellence. And that we take a longer, harder look at what we write on the ballots. Every student who walks into our room to be judged may not have as their goal to be in the finals of AFA or PRP at the end of the year. We must be less jaded. We must not forget the value of constructive criticism for educational purposes. We dare not continue to teach our students to be *forensic specialists* instead of teaching them life skills as well.

Over twenty-five years ago, George W. Ziegelmueller was the Conference Director for the 1972 National Developmental Conference on Forensics. In speaking about the evolution of forensics and forensics education, George remarked as to how diverse the current American forensics scene was. He stated:

> "The activities programs may be competitive (tournament oriented) or noncompetitive (audience oriented) or a combination of both. I protest that we have let the tournament oriented strain completely take over our field and have forgotten our roots of communication as an audience centered activity, thereby the necessity of having all public speaking events being audience oriented."

Tennyson once wrote, "Charm us, orator, till the lion look no larger than the cat." That indeed is a great skill to attain. But if we're not careful the lions are going to eat us. Directors of forensics will become discouraged, students will drop out of programs, programs will fade from existence. The pendulum is moving. Is it headed toward excellence or toward the mediocrity of sameness: greatness, but with no lasting substance? Thomas Mann remarked that

> "[t]ime has no divisions to mark its passage, there is never a thunderstorm or blare of trumpets to announce the beginning of a new month or year. Even when a new century begins it is only we mortals who ring bells and fire off pistols."

This is also true with the pendulum of forensics. There will be no thunderstorm or blare of trumpets to announce the approaching moment of its demise. It is only we mortal coaches who can ring the bells and fire off our pistols to make the necessary changes in our attitudes and those of our colleagues. We must treat forensic competition as the learning tool that it should be. As Sheryl A. Friedley spoke at a Speech Communication Association convention panel in 1992:

> ". . . forensic educators (must be) able to capitalize on . . . diversity--diversity in the myriad of skills forensics develops, diversity in the students forensics attracts, and diversity in various outlets the forensic community provides for competitive success as well as community service. If forensic educators fail to emphasize this diversity both to students and administrators, this activity may well limp, rather than leap, into the 21st century."

Perfection is a great goal, but it should not become so narrow of a goal that we neglect all of the odd cookies out there that have an unique taste of their own. These odd cookies, these students, are worth evaluating on their own merits, not being summarily rejected because they don't fit the customary perfect mold. And if you are not totally sick of analogies by now, this grandmother would like to remind each of us that time is ticking, the pendulum is swinging--only we can direct its course. There is no one *"perfect"* mold for public speaking events. Only we can truly define what forensic excellence is.

Works Cited

Friedley, S. A. (1992, November). Diversity: Key to forensics success in the 21st century. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL.

McBath, J. H. (Ed.). (1975). Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company in conjunction with the American Forensics Association and the Speech Communication Association.

FISHER'S NARRATIVE PARADIGM THEORY: A MODEL FOR DIFFERENTIATING AFTER DINNER SPEAKING FROM INFORMATIVE AND PERSUASIVE SPEAKING

C. Thomas Preston, Jr.
Associate Professor of Communication
University of Missouri-St. Louis, St. Louis, MO

As Schnoor and Karns (1992) have noted, a great spirit of camaraderie and cooperation existed after the Second Developmental Conference on Individual Events concerning the direction of events (pp. 13-16). One of the questions posed at this conference, the authors note, was how to improve the original speaking events. At this the Third Developmental Conference, we ask the question, "How do we discover effective new directions in the original speaking events?" Today, my paper will assess both tried and innovative new directions in after dinner speaking, with a discussion of the other original speaking events as necessary for background material. Particularly, I shall address how these new directions should be assessed on their ability to differentiate the pedagogical value of this event from those derived from participation in informative speaking and persuasive speaking, and to make the event more suitable to the public arena.

A discussion on the ie-1 from May and June of 1995, plus a review of the literature concerning the original speaking events before then (e. g., Congalton, & Olson, 1995, Ballinger and Brand, 1987; Driebelbis & Redmon, 1987; Kay, Borchers & Williams, 1992; Mills, 1984; Preston, 1990, 1992), indicates that in each original event in general and/or in after dinner speaking in particular, variations and even controversies exist as to how each event should be judged. As has been pointed out and quoted often, such disagreements can confuse more than educate our students (Lewis & Larsen, 1981).

The controversy surrounding after dinner speaking has traditionally revolved around three issues: 1) the purpose of the event in terms of humor and the role of the serious point, 2) the extent to which sources should be used, and 3) what, if anything, should be the real-world master analog for the event. Borrowing heavily from Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory (Cragan & Shields, 1995; Fisher, 1985, 1985a, 1985b, 1987a, 1987b, 1988, and 1989) as well as Congalton & Olson's (1995) ideas concerning event descriptions, this paper seeks to address each of these three controversies in presenting a unifying approach to the relationship of after dinner speaking to other original events.

The Controversy: What is a Good After Dinner Speech?

Driebelbis & Redmon (1987) reinforce the notion that controversies have surrounded the after dinner event, and that even as of the last decade, critics disagreed on how it should be judged. They cited the different AFA and NFA rules, noting that they may be the source for some disagreement. They did, however, seek to clarify the purpose of after dinner speaking by defining ADS as a speech whose primary purpose was to teach students how to persuade and make a serious point through humor. They differentiated this event from Phi Rho Pi and Pi Kappa Delta's event Speaking to Entertain, which, they argue, stresses the entertainment value over the persuasive value of the speech. Both STE and ADS, the authors argued, had the identical traits of structural development, a serious point, and good taste (pp. 101-102). Since many schools that attend Pi Kappa Delta nationals also have students who attend the AFA nationals, and since the biennial provincial tournaments for the former are qualifiers for the latter, the trend in both events has followed more the lines of persuasion through humor in recent years.

This trend seems to have occurred despite the argument Kay et al. (1992) made five years later that after dinner speeches should be more entertaining. Decrying that after dinner speeches came off as "stilted and tedious," the authors, nonetheless, argued that "an after dinner speech is a persuasive speech and an informative speech, using humor to sell the informative and persuasive messages" and "innovative organizational patterns, delivery techniques, and cleverly cited sources would make the after dinner speech more creative, enjoyable to watch, and educational" (p. 175). Although innovative organizational patterns and delivery techniques certainly can vivify after dinner speeches, the use of sources, if carried to an extreme, can prove deleterious to the entertainment value--which is fine if we accept the view that ADS is informative or persuasive speaking.

Yet if after dinner is informative or persuasive speaking, why have the event, especially with the time pressures already placed on students in a stressful tournament environment (see, for example, Hatfield, Hatfield, & Carver, 1989, and Littlefield & Sellnow, 1990)? Can't humor be used to sell a "real" informative or persuasive speech, and don't some of the more successful speeches in these genres use humor to sell themselves? As this author has often noted (e.g., Preston, 1990, 1992), for an event to be offered, it must be justified in terms of its *incremental* educational value, when juxtaposed to the aggregate of value offered by the other events. Thus, as in the case of extemporaneous and impromptu speaking (Preston, 1990, 1992) as well as the case of informative and persuasive speaking (Jensen, 1990), some differentiation between events in terms of both *mission* (the written rules and official event descriptions) and *practice* (how students feel compelled to perform the events in terms of what judges teach them wins) would be necessary. As has been touched upon in the previous analysis, the second controversy concerns the use of sources in after dinner speaking. For points of clarification and information, the American Forensic Association's rules--the ones which govern the "legs" and to which many tournaments adhere--for three original, prepared events follow:

> **Informative speaking:** an original, factual speech by the student on a realistic subject to fulfill the general aim to inform the audience. Audiovisual aids may or may not be used to supplement or reinforce the message. Multiple sources should be used and cited in the development of the speech. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time is 10 minutes including introduction.
>
> **Persuasive speaking:** an original speech by the student designed to inspire, reinforce or change the beliefs, attitudes, values, or actions of the audience. Audio-visual aids may or may not be used to supplement and reinforce the message. Multiple sources should be used and cited in the development of the speech. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.
>
> **After Dinner Speaking:** An original, humorous speech by the student, designed to exhibit sound speech composition, thematic coherence, direct communicative public speaking skills, and good taste. The speech should not resemble a night club act, an impersonation, or comic dialog. Audiovisual aids may or may not be use to supplement or reinforce the message. Minimal notes are permitted. Maximum time limit is 10 minutes.

Clearly, of these three events, after dinner speaking, as is true of NFA rules, does not specify the use of sources in after dinner speaking. In fact, as the both sets of rules state, students do not *have* to use sources, just as they do not *have* to use visual aids. However, inasmuch as the rules have not specified anything about source citation, from my own, independent observations, source citations have tended to proliferate in this event. The discussion on the ie-l I mention which occurred in 1995 indicated that students and coaches alike have mixed reactions to both the extent and implications of this perceived convention.

In addition to this conflict, scholars of after dinner speaking as a contest event disagree on both a) *whether* there should be a real-world analog to contest after dinner speaking, and, if so, b) *what* that master analog should be. Students and coaches alike in the ie-l thread disagreed over the necessity of a real-world analog for after dinner speaking, presenting a plethora of metaphors for what should constitute success in this event. First, differences abound about "what makes us laugh"--a subject of some controversy even among psychologists. Second, some argued, ADS *should* appeal to a specialized audience which constitutes the national forensics circuit's culture, and that as an event where academics communicate with one another, real world applications proved to be inappropriate analogs. Assuming there should be a real world analog for the event, scholars disagree on what that analog should be. For example, whereas Driebelbis and Redmon (1987) differentiate ADS from STE and claim that ADS should be a persuasive speech which uses humor as a vehicle, Kay et al. (1992) advocate changing the rules to empower the contestants to use some of the best potential analogs to ADS--comedy club speaking and the Washington press corps Gridiron Club roasts.

An Assessment of Past Remedies

To help ensure that the students have a clear idea of that which is expected of them, attempts have been made, mainly on the real world analog level, to make sure the students and coaches have a clearer notion of what is expected in this event. Because the rules reject the comedy club and implicitly the Gridiron Club analogs by banning standup routines, the rejection of the "tacked on" serious subpoint and a trend toward quantity, if not quality, of sources was perhaps inevitable. As well, since few academics would deny that each speech should make a point salient to the audience and provide documentation to establish credibility, few if any have been willing to attack the controversy at the levels of what role humor plays or number of sources cited. As well, attempts to address the problem on the real-world analog level seem to have mixed results.

First, since the *National Forensic Journal* reaches a relatively small audience, one finds it difficult to assess to what extent articles such as Mills (1984) and Driebelbis and Redmon (1987) had on the development of national circuit after dinner speaking. As well, this author is unfamiliar with the STE event at Phi Rho Pi. However, having observed the event at both the Pi Kappa Delta and American Forensic Association nationals, there would appear to be little change between the STE--which also bans standup routines at PKD--and the ADS at the April national tournaments. I know of few students who attend both who change their speech for Pi Kappa Delta to "make it more funny," or students who tilt toward the persuasion speech-style ADS when they go to AFA. In short, there would appear, based on anecdotal impression and observation, to be little difference between how the two events are practiced. This may vary at Phi Rho Pi.

Another concrete experiment in defining after dinner speaking was begun in 1994 at the Gateway Individual Events Tournament at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Here, we took Kay et al. up on their suggestion, but only to the extent that we offered an event called "comedy" to supplement the after dinner event rather than replace it. We feared that we would lose ADS entries if we changed the rules, as well as lose our standing as an AFA qualifier in that event. We tried to make the comedy event attractive--the time limit was only seven minutes (so that we could have finals at the student party, which was set in a comedy club/discotheque format), and the students could use the same topic as in after dinner speaking. Our rules stated that comedy would be judged on "level of humor solely," that sources were discouraged as the event should be "100 percent original," that the event did not have the same standards for "taste," "traditional organization," or a "serious point" as did a traditional after dinner speech, and, ultimately, that the comedy club was clearly the real world analog for the event. One goes to the comedy club to be entertained solely, thus one judges the event comedy, solely, on its entertainment value.

We were enthusiastic about the event, but each year it was offered it was by far the smallest event at the tournament (typically, duo improvisation and radio broadcasting, the other experimental events, attracted well over fifty contestants each, and even communication analysis attracts annually at least twenty at the Gateway; comedy never attracted more than fifteen). Feedback on the part of some participants concerned about taste was negative. By the third year of the event, we had to modify our stance on taste as the second year saw at least two speeches with grossly sexist language, and another with extreme obscenity, in the final round. As the entry still remained financially nonproductive to run last year, and as the rules became more similar to ADS, we relented and abandoned comedy. So enjoy ADS finals at this year's Gateway Karaoke party October 31.

Because of these experiences, this author is skeptical about reforming after dinner speaking at the real-world analog level, as to do so would fail to clarify the event for either coaches or students. Since written rules already differentiate the mission of the activity, changing them may not be necessary to ensure differential educational value, or to ensure that the event be enjoyed in the public arena. At the same time, some decisions need to be made on codifying the perceived unwritten conventions that have emerged in contest after dinner speaking, and while doing so, focus on two criteria for improvement: 1) on an educational level, differentiating after dinner speaking from informative and persuasive speaking and 2) an a practical level, returning after dinner speaking to the public arena. Several proposals, if adopted nationally, might contribute to achieving these ends.

Steps Toward Improving Contest After Dinner Speaking

Differentiating ADS from Informative and Persuasive

In light of the stress felt at tournaments and the emphasis on wellness that emerged at the First Developmental Conference in Denver, our activity should avoid events that offer little or no incremental educational value to our participants. The existing rules about after dinner speaking make that distinction on two levels--first, they don't mention documentation requirements for after dinner while they do for informative and persuasive speaking, and they mention humor for after dinner speaking while leaving that dimension unwritten in the rules for informative and persuasive speaking. Since the differences seem to occur on a micro level, using real-world analogs to make the differentiation might be difficult, and might explain the failures noted above. Yet although a *real-world analog* for after dinner speaking may prove undesirable or illusory especially since such an analog may change constantly (Kay et al. note, for example, that the comedy club which constitutes one of their real world analogs is a relatively recent, and perhaps ephemeral, development), an analog grounded *theoretically* in the study of communication might prove helpful to coaches and students alike. Because successful ADS requires skill in telling stories either as points or as the basis for a speech, a flexible application of Fisher's narrative paradigm theory (NPT) might prove to be helpful as a descriptive, analogic, and critical evaluative tool for locating similarities and differences in prepared speaking events. As well, a theoretically-based paradigm would be proactive rather than reactive.

Cragan and Shields (1995) summarize Fisher's NPT as follows:

> NPT's three basic concepts include narration (stories), logical reasons in the traditional sense, and good reasons in the value-laden narrative sense. NPT's narration structural terms include character, emplotment (plots), and two master analogs: idealistic-moralistic and materialistic. NPT's three evaluative terms include audience, narrative probability, and narrative fidelity.

In assuming that humans are storytellers *(homo narrans)*, Fisher also assumes that *all* human communication constitutes stories. As a general communication theory, NPT would apply to any of our individual events, whether they be limited preparation, original prepared, or interpretative performance. As such, these messages would constitute, in Fisher's (1987a) words, "symbolic interpretations of aspects of the world, occurring in time, and shaped by history, culture, and character" (p. xi). While applicable to all events, such elements ring particularly true with respect to after dinner speaking. Whereas Fisher recognizes traditional forms of support ("logical reasons in the traditional sense"), he also recognizes as persuasive alternative forms of support ("good reasons in the value-laden sense"). It is at this the basic-term level that we can begin to define the differences between informative/persuasive speech documentation (for this study we'll keep unresolved how Fisher might differentiate between informative and persuasive speaking) and after dinner speech documentation. I would argue in addition to the after dinner speaking *rules*, guidelines should be provided to all critics to reflect the supporting material expectations of the event--and that the documentation demands for informative and persuasive speaking stress logical reasons in the traditional sense, whereas those for after dinner speaking should stress good reasons in the *values* sense. Note that since no events can or should be entirely different, the persuasive elements involved in after dinner speaking should remain--yet with this distinction, the student and coach can see wherein the difference as to *how* to persuade would be. Such a distinction in what constitutes good reasons would also focus more back on the humor and entertainment value of after dinner speaking, without detracting from those who *choose* to use some documentation in the traditional sense.

Fisher's *structural* concepts provide not so much the areas of event differentiation, but what to differentiate about. For example, let's take the topic of unemployment. Regardless of the event in which a student performs an element of this topic, we will see, within the story, a treatment of the characters (the boss, the government, the unemployed person, his or her relatives, etc.), an emplotment (such as "from riches to rags" or "a funny thing happened on the way to work" or "finding out who your real friends are"), and a competition between two master analogs. One master analog could be an idealistic-moral master analog which supports (Cragan and Shields, 1995) "an egalitarian myth that characterizes all humans as created equal. It implies such values as tolerance, charity, trustworthiness, love, and justice," the other could be a materialistic master analog which "concerns individual success. It is a competitive myth that characterizes all humans as striving to get ahead.. This myth implies such embedded values as pleasure, self-aggrandizement, political acumen, self-reliance, competitiveness, playing the game, and achievement [Fisher, 1987a. . .]" (p. 103). Obviously, each master analog implies a different way out of the unemployment situation--whereas the former would be a government "safety net," the latter would be accepting responsibility for being unemployed, and the hope to climb out of the situation through individual initiative. Whether the student speech be informative, persuasive, or after dinner, according to Fisher's notions, it will address all of these notions. It is *how* these notions are treated that differentiates the events.

In the unemployment after dinner speech, the student could "play" the unemployed character, with humor being the vehicle for telling the story of becoming unemployed. The mind's fertile imagination might come up with characters (spouses, back-stabbing friends, an eccentric boss) whose ironic interactions with the unemployed person (the speaker) might have led to this condition. By telling these humorous yet plausible stories and playing them to the hilt, the speaker can weave the speech around the serious point which could choose its persuasive point somewhere along the idealistic-materialistic continuum. The ADS contestant could choose to humanize the unemployed figure by noting all of the ironic things that happen and how perceptions change (the thrown-away orange half becomes a delicacy if it's still cold) to promote the idealistic notion of having charity toward the unemployed, or, alternatively, he/she could joke about how the narrator caused the predicament to tell the story about how we the audience could avoid the same situation. Two observations emerge from this illustration--1) it is the *treatment* of the structural elements (humor) that would determine the speech type, not the structural elements themselves; and 2) whereas traditional documentation would serve as the focus of convincing the audience of which master analog to accept in a persuasive message (such as "How much should we help the unemployed?" or "Can we help the unemployed too much?") or an informative message ("Here's how to approach a friend recently unemployed," or "The psychological aspects you can expect if temporarily unemployed and how to cope"), alternative, experiential, and value-laden good reasons could hold the story together as well if not better in after dinner speaking.

Realizing that the locus of the difference lies in what constitutes good reasons, the critic can understand how Fisher's critical evaluative terms--audience, narrative probability, and narrative fidelity--apply differently to after dinner speaking. Through his stress on audience, Fisher allows critics and the forensics community as audience members some flexibility in applying his other means of conveying a speech, and provides the competitors of after dinner speaking a means of accepting a low ranking even though the speech may have received much laughter in the round. As Fisher (1987a) notes, "a story is as good as the audience that would adhere to it" (p. 105). On the one hand, such a notion would imply that the student should adhere to the norms as well as the rules established by and for the critic/auditors of the activity. The student should certainly adapt to the culture surrounding the activity. However, to the extent that cultures may vary from region to region, teaching students the basics of what constitutes good reasons in after dinner speaking may be confusing. Since audience is important, a case begins to be made for judge training, and some minimal, written agreement on what a trained critic should look for in an after dinner speech, regardless of the region of the nation in which it occurs. Just as a culture such as a "national forensics circuit" requires the adaptation of students and judges, it is just as necessary as we who constitute our culture consider our audience--the entire pool of students who decide not only whether or not to compete in forensics, but those who we would like to compete in after dinner speaking!

Secondly, judges of any speaking event should consider whether the performance "hangs together" or possesses, in Fisher's words, "narrative probability." According to Cragan and Shields (1995), narrative probability "deals with the audience's evaluation of the story's coherence, consistency, noncontradiction, and comparison and contrast with prior competing and accepted stories" (p. 104). As Cragan and Shields note, Fisher (1987a) gives the critic three ways to assess the narrative probability of a story (or after dinner speech, or any other event):

1. Check a story for its argumentative and structural coherence. For example, is the story internally consistent or are there contradictions?

2. Check a story for its material coherence. For example, are facts left out; are counterarguments ignored that are known to be present in competing stories?

3. Check a story for its characterological coherence. For example, are the character's attributes and actions in the story consistent, and are the story teller's attributes and actions consistent with those of the story?

Again, as a general communication theory, Fisher's NPT can be applied to any forensic event. However, the application of the method and how to apply the critical evaluative notions should differ if the events are to have a theoretically-based difference. In this case, rules and/or event descriptions should stress argumentative and structural coherence for informative and persuasive speaking as primary considerations and as secondary considerations for ADS, and material coherence should come to the forefront in both informative and persuasive speaking. However, the characterological coherence dimension should be stressed for after dinner speaking as the primary consideration. On balance, narrative probability should, aside from audience, be the primary consideration when judging persuasive and informative speaking, although it cannot be ignored entirely in after dinner speaking.

A third consideration in assessing any communication according to NPT is whether the communication "rings true," or possesses narrative fidelity. Clearly, the speeches and performances of any event which "ring true" to the critic/audience will prove most successful. In the real world, both traditional supports and experiential, value-laden supports must be analyzed in order to assess the success of a speech. However, in the real world, speeches do not always neatly into our event categories. Thus, a general application of whether a speech "rings true" does not help us differentiate after dinner speaking from the other events.

However, the dimension of narrative fidelity as a critical evaluative concept can help us differentiate between what proofs are required in which event. In persuasive and informative speaking, where some humor may vivify a speech but where humor is not necessary, again, the traditional forms of documentation, including consideration of whether all of the facts are included, whether they are accurately presented, and whether key arguments are identified, should be stressed. In after dinner speaking, that which makes us laugh is, arguably, that irony which "rings true" such that specific information as is included in traditional documentation should be stressed less.

Overall, then, Fisher's theory as a general communication theory can be clearly applied to all events, and on a structural and critical evaluative level, all of the notions noted above must be applied to have a complete Fisher analysis of performance effectiveness, regardless of event. However, by recognizing that the student has different, alternative good reasons than those of traditional documentation, the theory offers criteria that can be stressed in after dinner speaking, and de-emphasized in persuasion and informative speaking. That way, students and critics alike would have a means, grounded in communication theory, to locate different communication skills which can be stressed in different events such as after dinner speaking

Returning After Dinner Speaking to the Public Arena

Within the debate portion of our forensics activity, a splintering controversy has existed as to whether debate belongs to the public arena. Two forms of debate argue yes--the NPDA and NEDA forms. CEDA and NDT, on the other hand, have chosen to stress hard, academic, specialized debate. The latter group argues that such activity is valuable in that it enables students to communicate to a specialized audience in a way that requires them to process, synthesize, and analyze large amounts of material in a short period of time--as is increasingly required in our information age.

Nonetheless, public communication, as well, is considered important--and certainly, after dinner speeches, regardless of whether our analog be a real after dinner speech at the Rotary Club, a comedy club routine, or a Gridiron Club roast, fall toward the public communication end of the public-specialized continuum. As well, students have many opportunities, in forensics, to engage in events (such as extemporaneous speaking and rhetorical criticism) which tend toward specialization, as well as others (policy debate) which tend to go all of the way. These are beneficial activities, but activities that don't need replication in the event after dinner speaking. Thus, the question arises, what steps can be taken to promote after dinner speaking as a public speaking event? I would suggest several that would first determine to what extent the event ADS needs to be improved, and second how it could be improved, if necessary, in terms of both its mission and practice:

1. Find out the existence and/or extent of the problem. At tournaments throughout the nation, I intend to collect after dinner speaking ballots and compare them to persuasive speaking and informative speaking ballots. Similar to the ballot analysis studies Jensen (1990) and Preston (1990, 1992) conducted earlier this decade, I plan to categorize and count comments on these ballots to determine what types comments judges are making to determine what is important in after dinner and the other two events. By comparing these numbers, we should be able to come up with some idea as to how differently these events are being treated. My null hypothesis will be that after dinner speaking ballots de-emphasize sources, and emphasize humor. If these are disproven, I will argue, it will have been further demonstrated that we have some difficulty in not only differentiating this event from others we offer, but that we have allowed it to drip from the public arena. On the other hand, the study's evidence might argue that ADS is related to audience considerations, is different, and that the controversy is moot.

2. Have more public performances, including mass-judged final rounds. When an audience constitutes those without as well as within our field, students tend to adapt to what would be humorous to this type of audience. At the same time, when this is tried, clear instructions must be given to the audience members. At a minimum, the AFA rules which the students followed at the tournament should be used in the mass-judged finals, until they are changed and/or event descriptions added. These would ensure at least some familiarity with what skills should be stressed in this event. As a first step, the Gateway will, at its Karaoke party, hand out ballots to all attendees not attending the schools represented by the finalists. This will provide a first step toward a more general audience, such as is being tried at our mass-judged parliamentary debate finals. It will also enable us to assess, with survey and anecdotal impression information, the effectiveness of this exercise.

3. Provide a thorough event description for all events, including after dinner speaking, to assist critics. *As* Congalton and Olson (1995) have noted, relying on unwritten trends and conventions to "guess" what constitutes a good after dinner speech constitutes an elitist, "bad science" nonconducive to making the event consumable to the public arena. They note that in addition to the rules for the each event, a thorough event description, with all of the basic expectations, should be provided to all critics and students. There is really no need to change the after dinner speaking rules, as are, to achieve differentiation between ADS and informative and persuasive. However, a written guideline--adopted for the national tournament similar to those employed at some district tournaments in the west--for after dinner speaking would help. This guideline could, among other things, specify that, "clearly, although standards of tastes should be met, humor should be the primary means of relating the subject matter to the audience," and,

> "just as visual aids are optional in informative and after speeches, and just as they should supplement rather than structure or dominate the message, documented sources in the traditional vein are optional in after dinner speeches. Clearly, nontraditional 'good reasons' are to be considered equally with traditional documentation in this event as a means of making the serious point through the primary use of humor."

As well, the description could end with,

> "Although all elements of speech preparation and presentation are to be considered, the speech's entertainment value, to the extent that it goes hand in hand with the serious *raison d'etre*, should be your primary consideration when judging this event."

Such descriptions would represent an agreement over what the basic elements of an after dinner speech would be, and what skills are stressed, while giving the critic some flexibility in determining what constitutes "humor" and "good reasons."

4. Have, at a minimum, all school and experienced critics provide a clear judging philosophy for individual events, including after dinner speaking. Again, this experiment has been tried and has worked (Congalton & Olson, 1995) in some parts of the west. Especially in light of the norm that students may refer to each other's speeches in after dinner speaking, having philosophies available offers the students to adapt to their audiences, both in a general fashion, and as in Fisher's key critical-evaluative term "audience." As noted earlier, forcing on the critic/audience a rigid criteria would be stifling, and would ignore many speech-specific considerations of whether an after dinner message hung together and/or rang true to its critic. Although if a problem in after dinner speaking's educational value is discovered and the event is changed, some degree of adaptation to audience would prove more theoretically appropriate within Fisher's framework, but moreover, additionally useful for similar situations in the real world.

5. As Congalton & Olson (1995) have noted, thorough judge training would be a must for all those involved in judging the event as in suggestions 2-4 above. Tournament directors should be sure to explain these guidelines, in training sessions, in comprehensible terms, thus making the event accountable to the general, outside audience, consistent with both Fisher's theory and the net benefit of this event.

Conclusion

Today, I have, based on observations of the literature, anecdotal information, participant-observation as a tournament critic, and a discussion over the ie-l, assessed some of the potential challenges that face us as we try to improve on the event after dinner speaking. I have identified disagreements over the role of humor and the serious point in this event, the role of documentation in the traditional vein, and whether and/or what should be the real-world analogs for this event. Using Fisher's Narrative Paradigm Theory that applies to all individual events but especially to after dinner speaking, I have noted areas after dinner speaking shares in common with other communication activities, and I have attempted to offer how from Fisher's theory, what constitutes good reasons should be the main area wherein after dinner speaking should be differentiated from the other events.

Having noted that critics will vary regardless of the rules and that real world analogs failed, I offered five suggestions toward improving this event that leave open the possibility that the event is practiced well as is. Certainly, from these implications, it would appear that AFA rules sufficiently differentiate the event from persuasive and informative speaking, and also reflect an approach that would go over well in front of a general, public audience. However, whether the practice of after dinner speaking reflects this mission remains a question worthy of further analysis and study, in addition to continuing experiments such as mass judged finals.

By applying Fisher's NPT to the ADS event, it is hoped this paper will spur a discussion that at once 1) helps to better define after dinner speaking, 2) leads to more specific guidelines at the national level to accompany this and perhaps other events as is done in the west, 3) leads to better judge training consistent with Fisher's notion that audience is important in determining whether a story is accepted or rejected, and, above all, 4) provides a unifying perspective that still allows for individual differences in critic taste hence challenging the student to continue to learn the skills of adaptation even as fundamental expectations are clarified. If needed, such could enhance the educational value, as well as the camaraderie and social responsibility, offered in after dinner speaking within the framework of the present rules. In doing so, the forensics community could assert its leadership role in defining how speakers in non-academic settings should approach audience expectations for humor, rather than it being the other way around.

References

Ballinger, B. J. & Brand, J. D. (1987). Persuasive speaking: A review to enhance the educational experience. National Forensic Journal, 5(1), *49-54*.

Congalton, R. J. & Olson, C. (1995). Judging individual events: Art or science? The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 81(1), 9-18.

Cragan, J. F. & Shields, D. C. (1995). Symbolic theories in applied communication research: Bormann, Burke and Fisher. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Driebelbis, G. C., & Redmon, K. R. (1987). "But seriously, folks...": Suggestions and considerations for writing competitive after dinner speeches. National Forensic Journal, 5(2), 85-103.

Faules, G. F., Rieke, R. D. & Rhodes, J. (1976). Directing forensics: Contest and debate speaking. 2nd. ed. Denver: Morton.

Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. Communication Monographs, 51, 1-22.

Fisher, W. R. (1985a). The narrative paradigm: An elaboration. Communication Monographs, 52, 347-367.

Fisher, W. R. (1985b). The narrative paradigm: In the beginning. Journal of Communication, 35, 74-89.

Fisher, W. R (1987a). Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Fisher, W. R. (1988). The narrative paradigm and the interpretation and assessment of historical texts. Argumentation And Advocacy, 25, 49-53.

Fisher, W. R. (1989). Clarifying the narrative paradigm. Communication Monographs, 56, 55-58.

Hatfield, S. R., Hatfield, T. L., & Carver, C. (1989). Integrating wellness and forensics: Tournament management as a starting point. In L. Schnoor & V. Karns (Eds.), Perspectives on individual events: Proceedings of the First Developmental Conference on Individual Events, (pp. 26-29, 32). Mankato, MN: Speech Department of Mankato State University.

Jensen, S. L. (1990). A content analysis of public address critiques: In search of uniqueness in evaluative criteria and judging practices. National Forensic Journal, 8(2), 145-157.

Kay, J., Borchers, T. A. & Williams, S. L. (1992). Gridiron nights, comedy clubs, and after dinner speaking: Prescriptions from real world analogs. Argumentation and Advocacy, 28, 168-177.

Lewis, J. J. & Larsen, J. K. (1981). Inter-rater judge agreement in forensic competition. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 18, 1-14.

Littlefield, R. S. & Sellnow, T. L. (1992). Assessing competition and stress: The perceived effect of tournament atmosphere and students and coaches. National Forensic Journal, 10(1), 1-10.

IF IT'S PROBLEM-CAUSE-SOLUTION THIS MUST BE PERSUASIVE SPEAKING: ARE WE SHORT-CHANGING THE ART OF PERSUASION?

Shawnalee A. Whitney
Co-Director of Forensics
University of Alaska, Anchorage, Anchorage, AK

Every so often I think we should be taken to judge a round with a blindfold firmly in place. Those of us who spend a significant amount of time in the activity would likely be able to identify the event just by listening to the first speaker(s)--probably by listening to the introduction alone. Don't get me wrong. I think that speakers should make their topic and purpose explicit within the first minute or two of the speech in public address events. In addition, I genuinely enjoy coaching and teaching all manner of public speaking--in fact, it's probably my favorite dimension of this activity--so this is not the disgruntled voice of someone who should have stepped out gracefully somewhere back down the path of the almost two decades that I've been involved in speech and debate.

At the same time, however, I am concerned about things I am seeing in our activity. In particular, I am concerned about practices in public speaking events that seem to suggest that we may be giving in to the conventions of competition, allowing ourselves and our students to forget that the *content* and *purpose* should drive a communicative effort. Frequently, I see speeches that seem to be driven by the dominant organizational pattern and a desire to give a speech that looks like other speeches. In short, while the wide range of events available to students in competitive forensics affords plenty of opportunity for creativity, unique approaches, and fresh ideas, all too often it seems that the conventions of competition get the better of us and our students. The end result is potentially lackluster, formulaic speeches that have relatively little to do with the richly textured, highly challenging, incredibly complex art we know as public speaking.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the implications of two significant challenges that exist in Persuasive Speaking on the competitive circuit today: narrow topics and overly formulaic patterns of organization. I've elected to focus my paper on the event alternately known in intercollegiate forensics as *Persuasive Speaking*, *Persuasion*, and/or *Oratory*. For purposes of this paper, I use these three different labels interchangeably; my use of one label or another does not indicate concerns about or allegiance to a particular forensic organization that may use a given title for the event. For clarity, it is important to note that when I capitalize the terms (e.g. Persuasive Speaking or Persuasion), I am referring to a particular competitive event; when I do not capitalize the terms (e.g. persuasive speaking or persuasion), I am referring to the art and practice of persuasion, the body of theory and concepts, and other research that comprises the study of persuasion as put forth by scholars in communication and other disciplines across the academy.

The difficulties I see stemming from the conventions of competition are not unique to Persuasive Speaking. In fact, problems of a similar nature no doubt exist in other public address events featured in forensic competition. This paper will address Persuasion alone, however, in an effort to illuminate the problem in a focused fashion, thus providing a touchstone for exploring the same problem in other public speaking events. More importantly, this paper serves as a follow up to concerns raised about Persuasive Speaking at the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events held in 1990 in Denver, Colorado. Thus, I provide this as an exploration of where we are going, and where we have been with regard to Persuasive Speaking.

THOSE WHO DO NOT REMEMBER THE PAST...

Proceedings from the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events provide copies of two papers from the conference focusing on concerns about public speaking events. One paper considers the importance of allowing judges to ask questions of competitors in such events (Kanter, 1990), while the other explores the ethical use of evidence in public address (Friedly, 1990). While both of these papers address significant issues, one paper presented at the conference, but not included in the conference proceedings, has continued to stand out in my mind and guide my thinking about public address events in general and about Persuasive Speaking in particular. That paper, "Safe Sex and Safe Topics" (1990), was written by Captain Mike Dalby of the United States Air Force

Academy. In it he argued that students were being limited in what they could learn about persuasion because the conventions of competition steered them away from topics of a genuinely controversial nature and toward topics that were, as he termed them, "safe."

Dalby argued that competitive conventions led students to seek out topics for Persuasive Speaking that were not likely to spark any true discomfort in or discord for judges or other audience members, were not likely to significantly challenge a listener's system of belief, and were likely to be an offer the listener couldn't refuse. That is why he drew the connection between "safe sex" and "safe topics" in the title of his paper. The idea of "safe sex" is fairly noncontroversial--few people would object to the possibility of saving lives through simple procedures that listeners could enact themselves during sexual intercourse. Think of the topics you saw addressed on the circuit during the past competitive season. How many of them were truly controversial? How many of them really challenged a system of values or beliefs? Probably not many.

The problem, as Dalby saw it, was that persuasion in the "real world" was not so antiseptic, not so cut and dried. To persuade people outside a round of competition often one must overcome deep-seated objections and give consideration to the listeners' beliefs in far more complex and challenging ways than we generally see in competitive rounds. I will grant that competitive speakers have only 10 minutes in which to present an argument as to why the audience should act in a certain way or embrace a particular belief, but that does not relieve forensic educators of the responsibility to teach the full range of possible approaches to persuasion and it does not absolve speakers of the necessity of mastering those skills.

Mike Dalby was trying to remind the forensics community that speakers must not be afraid to address controversial issues. A complete forensic education should prepare a speaker to address the widest possible range of topics, issues, and so on. Moreover, forensics pedagogy should provide speakers with the ability to address such issues in a manner that is effective and appropriate to the topic, the audience, and the occasion at hand. Mike Dalby was encouraging us to be mindful of the fact that sometimes, the topic, the audience, and the occasion are more complex than a round at a tournament. I think he was right and the resolutions passed at the 1990 conference indicate that many other conference attendees agreed with him as well.

While not all resolutions addressed Persuasion specifically, those who attended the conference endorsed fourteen resolutions focusing on problems in a broad category labeled *Public Speaking*. While conference attendees weighed in on a wide range of issues through resolutions, the Public Speaking category featured more resolutions than *any* other dimension of the conference.[1] Clearly, this area of forensic competition and forensics pedagogy continues to be of concern for many of us. Despite the fact that many of us seem to share concerns about public address events, however, practices in these events on the competitive circuit seem to become more entrenched with each passing year. Sadly, if I were to run into Mike Dalby today, I would have to report that I have not seen much change in Persuasive Speaking in response to the concerns he and others raised at the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events.

There are dimensions of forensics that seem so commonplace that we may come to think of them as certainties. It has almost become a certainty that once the season starts the charges of what is and is not a *trend* will be widely bandied about on the ie-l, a listserve devoted to the intercollegiate individual events community and generously overseen by the forensics program at Cornell University. I have to admit that I cringe when I read a post to the list discussing "the current trend in (fill-in-name-of-event)." The claim that a particular practice, type of topic, type of piece, and so on is a trend is often based on the fact that one person saw this particular practice in a particular round. While the ie-l is a great place for diverse discussions between new students, experienced students, former competitors, coaches, and so on, we need to be quick to remind list subscribers that one speech *does not* constitute a trend. That said, the problems I put forth in this paper are based on judging many rounds of Persuasive Speaking, reviewing videotapes of the final round of the event from national tournaments, and reviewing compilations of winning speeches such as *Championship Debates and Speeches* and the manuscripts from past tournaments of the Interstate Oratorical Association.

---

[1] Those who attended the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events in 1990 in Denver, Colorado, endorsed a total of 65 resolutions on six different topics. The previous two conferences of a similar nature, the 1984 National Developmental Conference on Forensics and the First National Developmental Conference on Individual Events held in 1988, itemized over fifty issues of concern (Porter, 1990). Many of the concerns raised through resolutions endorsed at those conferences continue to be topics of discussion, the subject of forensics research, and so on even 13 years after the first conference. Those who wish to review the specific areas of concern from each of the conferences are encouraged to seek out a copy of the proceedings from each of the three conferences.

As noted in this paper, 14 of the 1990 resolutions focused on concerns about Public Speaking events. The remaining categories broke down as follows: concerns about New Programs received 9 resolutions, Oral Interpretation featured 12, Training Practices for coaches & judges received 10, the Hierarchy of the forensics community & its organizations had 12, and the Educational/Competitive Duality of forensic activities received 8.

On the other hand, this paper is not a statistical analysis of practices in Persuasive Speaking. I have not counted the number of times I've seen a particular organizational pattern, nor have I done a content analysis of each speech I've reviewed to come to the conclusions I offer here. In addition, the problems I cite may not be evident in all rounds of Persuasive Speaking across the country. Nonetheless, I believe we should keep these issues in mind as we judge and as we teach forensic competitors in order to strengthen our activity. Specifically, I believe there are two key challenges facing Persuasive Speaking at present in competitive forensics: (1) the narrow focus of topics in the event and (2) the limited number of organizational patterns in use.

CHALLENGE NUMBER ONE:
THE RANGE OF TOPICS IS OVERLY NARROW

Persuasive Speaking seems to continue to feature what Dalby referred to as "safe" topics. In other words, competitors seem drawn to or are encouraged to seek out topics that are not terribly "controversial." Such topics generally do not call for a significant change of attitude or course action on the part of a listener, and as a result the speeches are not always as challenging as one might hope and there is a certain "sameness" to many of them.

Why are students and coaches drawn to such topics? Why do forensics folks watch television reports such as prime time news magazines like *20/20* and *Dateline NBC* hoping to find the disease-of-the-month, the problem-of-the-week, and hoping that it can be solved by simple steps that can be taken by almost anyone? If Stone Phillips, Jane Pauley, and the other folks at *Dateline NBC* can explore a problem, explain its causes, and present us with workable solutions for three to four different issues during the course of a one hour broadcast, surely members of the forensics community can do the topic justice in 10 minutes!

Perhaps the forensics community has been drawn to "safe" topics for the same reason that they are so popular on news magazines--viewer appeal. Television programs (and print sources that provide topics of a similar nature) survive only when they have viewers or readers. In competition, speeches are seen as "competitive" when they are endorsed by judges on ballots. Consequently, just as news media may shy away from topics they think viewers will not like, students may have a sense of fear judges may rank persuasive speeches on the basis of their personal beliefs or their ability to enact personal solutions. This fear can lead students to select "safe" topics, those with a broad-based appeal and individual solvency, and shy away from topics that cannot be solved or acted upon in a simple fashion, thus limiting the need for more challenging and more complex forms of audience analysis and speech construction.

Have your students received ballots that had comments such as "how does this effect me?" Have such comments played a role in the judge's decision? While it can be difficult to divorce oneself from personal beliefs and motivations, a judge need not believe the speaker with his or her "heart of hearts" in order to evaluate the speaker's effort in terms of content, organization, and delivery. The judge need not change his or her personal attitudes or behaviors as a result of hearing the speech. In short, the task a judge faces is to effectively evaluate the persuasive effort within the parameters of the event guidelines, standards of sound, ethical persuasion, and so on, not on the basis of how the topic effects the judge as an individual. This argument corresponds directly with a resolution from the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events which reads: "Tournament directors inform and encourage judges to set aside personal opinions regarding subject matter in public address events"

(Public Speaking, Item 5), but it does not seem that this resolution has been enacted across the forensics community.

One might argue that selecting "safe" topics because they have the broadest possible audience appeal, because few people object to such topics, and because they are unlikely to "offend" the personal sensibilities of a judge reflects sound audience analysis. After all, the audience one addresses at tournaments changes from round to round and may include anyone from a college professor to a lay person. Moreover, altering a prepared speech to adapt it to a particular audience poses significant difficulties for the speaker, particularly when he or she has had virtually no chance to investigate the nature of his or her audience. But the implication is clear--if students are limited in the range of topics for Persuasive Speaking by overarching considerations like "how can the judge, as an individual, solve this problem" we are teaching students a very limited form of persuasion.

The question then is what do we want Persuasive Speaking to be? Do we want the event to be the presentation of an argument that encourages a change of attitude or course of action aimed at the broadest possible audience? If so, we may be succeeding. If, however, we want students to learn about persuasion in a broader sense, I believe we are falling short and we have not yet followed up on the concerns expressed at the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events.

I am not arguing that students must seek out the most controversial topics available in order to learn about the process of persuasion, but I believe the conventions of competition continue to drive the process of topic selection and we must find ways to expand the field of topics that can be competitive. We need to repeat the call for judges to set aside personal opinions regarding subject matter in Persuasive Speaking and, as coaches and judges, we must respond to that call.

CHALLENGE NUMBER TWO: LITTLE VARIETY IN PATTERNS OF ORGANIZATION

The type of persuasion seen on *Dateline NBC* and *20/20* is affectionately referred to by some as "info-suasion" on the forensics circuit and it is just as common at forensics tournaments as it is on prime time television. Reports and speeches of this type generally (1) inform you of a problem you never knew existed, while at the same time explaining the significant risk you and your loved ones face as a result of the problem. In addition, they (2) explain the causes of this significant problem, and finally (3), they offer simple steps anyone can and should take to ameliorate the problem. Most of us know this organizational pattern as problem-cause-solution and it is a perfectly legitimate approach to structuring your ideas in a persuasive effort, but it is *not* the *only* approach.

The proceedings of the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events endorsed a resolution calling for judges to set aside personal feelings and beliefs when evaluating organizational patterns in public address events. The resolution reads: "Tournament directors inform and encourage judges to set aside personal opinions with regard to organizational patterns such as problem-solution (Resolutions Section, Public Speaking, Item 6). While the proceedings do not indicate a rationale for the resolution and my memory of our discussion on this issue has faded, it seems entirely appropriate for coaches and judges to comment on organizational patterns. Comments such as "I am so tired of hearing problem-solution speeches" are inappropriate because they are not constructive, but comments regarding the interface between content, purpose, and appropriateness of structure seem completely in line with forensics pedagogy.

My concern regarding organization is that what we see in rounds suggests that students are learning only a very limited number of approaches to structuring persuasive arguments. Most of the speeches in Persuasive Speaking as a competitive event follow one of two organizational patterns: problem-solution and problem-cause solution. While both of these approaches are perfectly acceptable, they are just the tip of the iceberg. There are *many* different ways to organize a persuasive message. A brief review of several nationally recognized public speaking texts (Ayres & Miller, 1994; Jaffe, 1998; Lucas, 1992; Osborn & Osborn, 1997; Zarefsky, 1996) reveals a wide range of approaches to the organization of persuasive messages including: categorical organization, criteria satisfaction, negative method pattern/refutation, sequential design, statement of reasons/topical ordering, comparative advantages/compare and contrast, residual reasoning, proposition-to-proof, Monroe's motivational sequence, problem-solution, and problem-cause-solution.

As forensics educators, we must help our students understand *that the purpose and content of a message calls forth or demands an appropriate organizational pattern*. There are persuasive messages that do not fit into the problem-solution and/or problem-cause-solution pattern that seems to be the hallmark of so many competitive speeches in Persuasion. Students should not shy away from topics because they do not conform to those particular patterns, rather coaches and judges should remember that there are a wide range of approaches to the art of persuasion and that forensic competition should reflect the diversity of approaches available for structuring such messages. Employing a particular organizational structure *solely* because it seems to fit *competitive convention* denies the vast body of theory and persuasive strategies that are available to those who seek to persuade others.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Public address events have the potential to provide forensic competitors with a wide range of experiences relevant to the effective construction and delivery of messages. I believe we must continue to use the tools at our disposal to encourage our community to embrace a variety of approaches to public speaking events--in this case, Persuasive Speaking.

As teachers, coaches, and judges, we must encourage students to think about their choice of topics and their use of organizational patterns. We must help them see the importance of seeking out topics that seem important and interesting, not just those that meet the current conventions of competition. We must use public address events in general, and Persuasion in particular, to introduce students to the full range of public speaking experiences. If we use public speaking experiences to engender critical thinking about topics and approaches to expression, we are one step closer to the kind of forensic education that helps students "become more mentally aware of their choice-making processes" (Aden, 1991). If we introduce students to the full range of approaches to persuasion, they will have "a firm theoretical foundation from which to build and refer as needed" (Schnell, 1992). To limit students' experiences solely to what is perceived as competitive short changes students, forensics education, and the art of public speaking.

As judges, we must use the ballot to reward creativity and encourage students to explore a wider range of topics and organizational patterns. Judges should not punish speakers who employ problem-solution or problem-cause-solution solely because they employ a particular organizational pattern. Nor should we reward other patterns of organization simply for their difference. Instead, we should evaluate the marriage of *topic*, *content*, *purpose*, *and organization*, rewarding exemplary persuasive messages regardless of perceived conventions or trends in a particular event. After all, the conventions became convention through repeated use in competition and they may be changed through new modes of practice.

In order to evaluate our progress on the issues explored in this paper, members of the forensic community should undertake research that may give us a clearer indication of the diversity or lack of diversity in topics and organizational patterns in Persuasive Speeches in competition. Similar research may be applied to other events in order to access how well we are using forensic competition to teach students about a wide range of types of and approaches to the art of communication.

Standards exist in our forensic event in order to enable us to comparatively evaluate student performances in terms of content, organization, and delivery. Thus, it is not surprising that we would likely be able to identify the event we were judging even if blindfolded. Based on the potential for a wide range of topics and the existence of many different approaches to persuasion, however, we should expect to hear a diverse range of speeches in each round we judge. As forensics educators, we must remind ourselves of the range of options available in persuasion and encourage our students to expand their horizons and challenge themselves and the "boundaries" of the event by looking beyond the one or two approaches to Persuasion that seem most common on the competitive circuit.

Works Cited

Aden, R. (1991/1992). The goals of a forensics education. The Forensic Educator, 6(1), 15-18.

Ayres, J. & Miller, J. (1994). Effective public speaking, (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Dalby, M. (1990, August). Safe sex and safe topics. Unpublished paper from the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Denver, Colorado.

Friedly, S. A. (1990). The ethical use of evidence in public address events. In Schnoor, L. & Karns, V. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Denver, CO.

Jaffee, C. (1998). Public speaking: Concepts and skills for a diverse society, (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Kanter, E. T. (1990). A question of oral questions: Why aren't judges allowed to query competitors? In Schnoor, L. & Karns, V. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Denver, CO.

Lucas, S. E. (1992). The art of public speaking, (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Osborn, M. & Osborn, S. (1997). Public speaking, (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Porter, S. (1990). When we don't know where we're going . . . perhaps it's time we find a map. In Schnoor, L. & Karns, V. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Second National Developmental Conference on Individual Events. Denver, CO.

Schnell, J. (1992/1993). Persuasion as a developmental sequence for the beginning competitor in interscholastic forensics. The Forensic Educator, 1(1), 17-19.

Zarefsky, D. (1996). Public speaking: Strategies for success. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.